NOV 19 1927

Mr. S. Chait.

2

50 ob 52

Z/DA

THE

FREETHINKING

CHRISTIANS'

QUARTERLY REGISTER.

VOL. II.

"For we can do nothing against the truth, but for the truth."—PAUL.

LONDON:

H. HETHERINGTON, PRINTER, 13, KINGSGATE STREET.

PUBLISHED BY SHERWOOD, GILBERT, AND PIPER,

PATERNOSTER ROW.

1825.

PREFACE.

From a survey of the contents of the present volume, it will be seen that we have completed our examination of the popular but anti-christian doctrines of the fall of man, and of the existence of an immortal, immaterial soul, which would render unnecessary a resurrection from the dead. The erroneous and unscriptural tenets of Quakerism have been further examined; and the claims and character of that canting party, whose chief end and aim are the applause of this world, have been more fully exposed. On the subject of social prayer we have completed our examination of the Old Testament; but with the remainder of that inquiry we have been obliged to content ourselves with an abstract only. We quit this subject, thus imperfectly concluded, with the greater reluctance, from a sense of its high importance to the right understanding of the religion of Jesus. Not the least important articles in the volume, are those headed "Dissenters' Marriages." The Unitarian body, we have, at length, succeeded in exciting to serious exertions on this subject; their efforts have hitherto been counteracted chiefly by the interested opposition of the established priesthood; but for them, and for ourselves, we cannot but anticipate ultimate success.

With the second volume, now completed, our labours cease—at least for the present. Our objects in writing have already been explained to our readers—to lay before them views of religious truth, the result of laborious and, we may add, of conscientious and honest inquiry on our own part:—inquiry pursued from a love of truth only, and in no way instigated by that which (in consequence of the prevalence of priestcraft) is generally connected with theological discussion—the love of gain!

A labour which we have undertaken voluntarily, we feel ourselves at full liberty to discontinue at pleasure. The sale of our work, although not sufficient to make it profitable to ourselves, has been considerably greater than could have been anticipated;—and that sale promised to increase. But much which we had proposed to do

has *been* done in the two volumes now before the Public; whilst other occupations not less incumbent upon us, and other duties not less important, *compel* us to decline a continuance of the present publication. We have done something, if we have only shewn what *can* be done by a few inquiring minds, unaided by learning and the usual helps of literary composition—writing neither for fame nor profit, but, who having thought freely and for themselves, give to the world, in a plain and unvarnished manner, the fruits of their inquiry. To those, if such there be, who think that we ought not to have discontinued our labours, we can only say—that we leave them our example, which they may follow at pleasure, and themselves supply the vacancy which we have left. Others, freeing themselves from the trammels of superstition and priestcraft, may think freely and communicate their thoughts as we have done. From our own experience we can assure such that the possession of truth is well worth the labour which it costs to acquire; and that, however little estimated by the world at large, the pursuit will bring with it its own reward.

All pecuniary profit, in this or any other religious undertaking, we have already distinctly disclaimed; neither have we been induced by the mere pleasure of speculative inquiry to add to the list of theological publications. All that we have written has been directed to the great end of mental enlightenment and moral improvement; and, convinced that nothing can so effectually conduce thereto as clear views and just conceptions of the religion of Jesus, it has been our endeavour to clear that divine system from the corruptions by which it has been defaced, and the errors to which it has been allied. Our ability, if the reader shall be of opinion we have manifested ability to this task, are all ascribable to the glorious hopes and ennobling truths of revealed religion, receiving their efficacy and direction from that system of Unity, Equality, and Discipline given by Jesus and his apostles for the government of the church of God. We take this opportunity of adding, that with all parties seriously desirous of further information regarding our principles and union, we shall be happy to communicate, and their inquiries to this end may be addressed to "*the Elder of the Church denominated Free-thinking Christians*," and forwarded to the office of the Printer of this Work, No. 13, Kingsgate Street, Holborn.

THE

FREETHINKING

CHRISTIANS'

QUARTERLY REGISTER.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE FALL OF MAN DISPROVED,

By an Explanation of the early part of the Book of Genesis.

ESSAY II.

REFERRING to the introductory Essay under the above title, (vol. i. p. 136) it will be seen that that portion of the early chapters of Genesis has been explained, which describes the creation of man—his being placed in a garden for the purpose of security—his receiving oral instruction from Deity for the improvement of his understanding; and, with a view at once to the comfort of the individual, and the peopling of the earth, his being provided with a partner of his own species.

Of the history of our first parents, we hear no more till what is called the temptation of Eve; which, from the brevity of the history, would appear to have taken place immediately; but it is highly probable that some time had elapsed, in which nothing necessary for instruction, or worth recording, had occurred: but, as every event had been so arranged as to promote their moral instruction, and to prepare them for a more enlarged sphere of action, this temptation is allowed, with the same view, to take place. In the third

chapter we are informed, that "*the serpent** *was more subtle*" (probably in the estimation of the woman) "*than any beast of* "*the field which the Lord God had made: and he said unto the* "*woman, Yea, hath God said, ye shall not eat of every tree of the* "*garden? And the woman said unto the serpent, We may eat of* "*the fruit of the trees of the garden; but of the fruit of the* "*tree which is in the midst of the garden, God hath said, Ye* "*shall not eat of it, neither shall ye touch it, lest ye die. And* "*the serpent said unto the woman, Ye shall not surely die; for* "*God doth know that in the day ye eat thereof, then your eyes* "*shall be opened; and ye shall be as gods, knowing good from* "*evil. And when the woman* SAW" (not heard) "*that the* "*tree was good for food, and that it was pleasant to the eyes,* "*and a tree to be desired to make one wise, she took of the* "*fruit thereof, and did eat, and gave also to her husband with* "*her, and he did eat.*" The above colloquy, had it been found in any other book, particularly in any other early and eastern writing, would have been readily and justly interpreted. It would have immediately occurred to the reader (the serpent not having the faculty of speech), that that could not have been a real conversation. The true interpretation, indeed, must be obvious. The woman *saw* the serpent coiling itself around the tree, and eating of that

---

* Let it be particularly noted that the *serpent* only is here spoken of; no mention is made of a devil, or evil spirit: no allusion whatever, direct or indirect, is made to this serpent as being in any way distinguished from other serpents. That it is described as speaking, will be explained in the text; but in any case it is the *serpent* that is said to speak, not the devil *in* the serpent. How different necessarily becomes the language of Milton, who, to support the *fiction* of the fall of man, is compelled to add to the story *fictitious* circumstances. He relates, that Satan,

> "With inspection deep,
> Considered every creature, which of all
> Most opportune, might serve his wiles, and found
> The serpent, subtlest beast of all the field."

Having made this choice, the Poet tells us that

> "In at his mouth
> The devil entered, and his brutal sense
> (In heart or head) possessing, soon inspired
> With act intelligential."

But of all this there occurs not one word in the book of Genesis. How many are there who have fancied they were believing in the Bible, whilst they were in fact only believing in Paradise Lost.

fruit with pleasure and delight which *they* were forbidden to touch. Having, probably, supposed that it was the quality of the food which was to occasion death if they partook of it, yet, seeing that no ill consequences resulted to the serpent from eating it, she appears to have reasoned in her own mind on the subject; and, suspecting that the prohibition might have arisen from jealousy on the part of the Deity, lest they should become as wise as himself—the more especially as it was also called the tree of knowledge of good and evil—she determined to try its effect, and she ate thereof. Thus the reasoning which passed within her mind is, naturally enough, put down, as though she had expressed those thoughts in words: and the actions of the serpent are likewise embodied in language, because they produced upon her mind the same effect as if it had spoken. It is in our own times a common remark, that actions speak louder than words; and, in the sacred writings, language is often ascribed even to trees and other inanimate things. When, indeed, we consider that the whole of this history must have been handed down by tradition, and in the first instance recorded by that earliest species of writing, the *hieroglyphic*, we cannot wonder at this substitution of words in the stead of actions; as it will be remembered that the pictorial representation of the subject would equally, in either case, be that of the serpent holding communication, or appearing to enter into conversation with the woman.

Neither is this exposition a novel one; for a similar suggestion, we are informed by Dr. Geddes, (Preface, p. 9) was made by Abrabanal, a learned Jew of the fifteenth century; which was followed by Simeon de Muis, Hebrew Professor in the College at Paris, about the middle of the last century: and the same view has been more recently adopted, with improvements, by an anonymous writer, in Eichorn's Biblical Repertory.—"According to this hypo-
"thesis the serpent was a real serpent, such as he still is;
"neither endowed with speech, nor organized by the devil;
"nor had he any conversation with the woman—what then?
"The woman observed him eating of that very fruit which
"had been forbidden to her, without his receiving any injury
"from it, therefore she inferred that it could not be deadly;
"on the other hand, it was beautiful to look at—knowledge
"was a desirable thing: all these considerations induced
"her to make a trial—the issue is known." Could any thing, indeed, be more natural or instructive than to represent it, as the writer of Genesis has done, under the figure

of a conversation? Led away by this temptation, the dire offence was committed; the threatened penalty of which (although that penalty was afterwards commuted for hard labour in the field) was immediate death:—"*in the day that* "*thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die.*" The words here translated *surely die,* occur but three times in the Old Testament; Exodus x. 28; 1 Kings ii. 37, 46; besides this case in Genesis; and in each place it will be seen to bear no reference to *moral* death, or to any state of future punishment, but to *instant, immediate, bodily* death: neither is any thing said of the posterity of Adam in this threat; indeed no such reference could have been necessary; for had the sentence been executed on him, he could have had no posterity at all; nor could Adam himself have had an idea of any other death than the being deprived of that existence which he had received from his Maker.

Adam, then, agreeably to the strict letter of the law, was condemned to death; he waited only the sentence of his judge, uncertain whether he would remit any part, or demand the whole penalty of the bond. Thus, as the Apostle justly reasons on this event, "*by one man sin was introduced into* "*the world; and death*" (or rather condemnation) "*for sin:*" that is, as Adam was the first sinner, and the first example of condemnation for sin—and as all men have followed his example, death or condemnation, according to strict law, has passed upon all men; and that not for the sin of Adam, but, argues Paul, (Rom. v. 12) "*because* ALL *have sinned:*" for "*whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in* ONE "POINT, *is guilty of all.*" (James ii. 10.) Thus, the man who violates any one law of his country to which the penalty of death is affixed, is, according to that law, dead; he is in a state of condemnation even before he be tried, or sentence passed; and nothing can take off that condemnation, or restore to him his forfeited life, but the grace and favour of his sovereign: should *he* be pleased to proclaim his pardon altogether, or to mitigate the penalty, the man is then alive again; and that law which condemned to death, has no power over him. Adam, then, having broken the law, stood condemned to death, and waited with dread and apprehension the sentence of his judge. In the language of the history, "*the eyes of both of them were opened, and they knew* "*that they were naked; and they sewed fig leaves together, and* "*made themselves aprons.*" This verse is, however, in our common version, very improperly translated: there was in their case nothing to make them more sensible of being un-

clothed than before. By the word naked is here meant, as in many other places, that they knew they were without defence;* they had sinned, and were naked or exposed to the divine displeasure; they made, therefore—not aprons, but, by entwining fig leaves or branches, they formed a place in which to hide themselves from their offended God;—a view of the passage, which is further explained by the following verse; "*and they heard the voice of the Lord God*" (probably some symbol to which they were accustomed, as representing the Divine Being) "*walking in the cool of the day, and Adam* "*and his wife hid themselves from the presence of the Lord* "*AMONG THE TREES OF THE GARDEN; and the Lord God* "*called unto Adam, and said unto him, Where art thou? and* "*he said, I heard thy voice in the garden, and I was afraid,* "*because I was naked,*" (without defence) "*and I hid myself.*" Here was taught another moral lesson to Adam and his helpmate—that fear and shame necessarily accompany guilt. "*And he*" (God) "*said, Who told thee that thou wast naked?*" (exposed to punishment) "*hast thou eaten of the tree whereof* "*I commanded thee that thou shouldst not eat?*" Here then the trial, as it were, commences: the criminals are arraigned before their Judge; they plead guilty to the charge; no attempt is made to justify the act; their only endeavour is to extenuate, if possible, their crime; but throwing themselves wholly on the mercy of their Judge, they appear to have awaited his awful sentence. In reply to the question, "*Hast thou eaten,*" &c. Adam answers, "*the woman whom* "*thou gavest to be with me, she gave me of the tree, and I did* "*eat. And the Lord God said to the woman, What is this* "*that thou hast done? And the woman said, The serpent* "*beguiled me, and I did eat.*" Here are most simple and artless answers; not the smallest attempt at evasion or equivocation. When, therefore, we consider these circumstances—and that it was their first, and, as far as history informs us, their last offence—that their whole conduct was humble, resigned, and penitent, it cannot be too much to say, that, if ever criminals deserved the merciful consideration of their Judge, and the mitigation of threatened punishment, Adam and Eve stood most pre-eminently entitled thereto. The sequel of the history will shew that they did obtain this consideration—this mitigation. The guilt of

* See Exodus xxxii. 25; 2 Chron. xxviii. 19; Proverbs xxix. 18; Jeremiah li. 58; Micah i. 11; and also Cruden's Concordance on the word *naked*.

first parents.* *Many* cases of a similar kind might be referred to, where appeals are made by the apostles to the Jewish scriptures, in support of the mission of their master, shewing that he was the prophet foreseen by Abraham, by Moses, by David and the Prophets—why then if *they* believed that *this* was a prophecy referring to the Messiah, did they not advert to it in support of his claims and character? Rejecting, therefore, this unfounded interpretation, we proceed—and it appears that nothing now remained but for the Judge to pronounce sentence. The guilty pair awaited, doubtless with trembling anxiety, the doom of death to be inflicted according to the previous threat; their experience had not then taught them that the threatenings of a merciful God towards his weak and erring creatures, are always conditional. The fate, in after ages, of the city of Nineveh, presents a striking instance of this; where God, by his prophet, declared that in forty days Nineveh should be destroyed: yet notwithstanding this apparently unconditional sentence, Nineveh repented, and God spared it. Had our first parents, guiltless as they were in comparison with the inhabitants of Nineveh, entertained these notions of Deity, they would doubtless have confided in the benevolence of that Being who delighteth in mercy, and who declareth that judgment is his strange work; who knoweth whereof we are made, and who remembereth that we are but dust. From this all-merciful Judge they received, what from our better knowledge of him we must expect, a kind and gracious sentence, full of mercy and goodness—a sentence which perfectly agrees with the words of the Poet—

> "Good when he gives—supremely good,
> Nor less when he denies;
> E'en crosses from his sov'reign hand
> Are blessings in disguise,"

for "*unto the woman he* (God) *said, I will multiply thy sor-* "*row, and*" (or in) "*thy conception; in sorrow thou shalt* "*bring forth children, and thy desire shall be*" (or, as it is rendered in the margin of our common version, *thou shalt be subject*) "*to thy husband, and he shall rule over thee.*" Here

* It is worthy of remark, whilst this form of expression "*the seed of the* "*woman,*" is never applied to Jesus, he is, in common with believers, frequently designated as "*the seed of Abraham.*" See John viii. 39; Gal. iii. 14—16 to 29.

let it, in the first place, be remarked, is *the whole* of the sentence passed on the woman; yet here is not one word of death temporal, death spiritual, or death eternal; nor, above all, is there one denunciation against her posterity: the sentence even to herself personally is (at once mercifully and justly) a mitigated one; and, with regard to *her* at least, to look at her case separately from her husband's, she, as far as regards the sentence passed on her, remains immortal, *if* she was before immortal; and of her it may be truly said, that she had passed from death unto life.

Let us now proceed to the sentence passed upon Adam:— "*And unto Adam he* (God) *said, because thou hast hearkened* "*to the voice of thy wife, and hast eaten of the tree which I* "*commanded thee saying thou shalt not eat of it, cursed is the* "*ground for thy sake; in sorrow shalt thou eat of it all the* "*days of thy life; thorns also and thistles shall it bring forth* "*to thee; and thou shalt eat of the herb of the field, in the* "*sweat of thy brow shalt thou eat bread.*" Of this sentence, as of that on the woman, it may be first remarked, that it probably contains no real punishment; though such to them it was, at the time, for wise and benevolent purposes, made to appear. They were yet childless; Eve was, therefore, as yet, ignorant of the pains of child-birth, which there can be little doubt would have been the same even if she had not transgressed. This, therefore, may be considered as a merciful means of leading her to bear patiently what, by the constitution of her nature, was inevitable. They had as yet lived in a garden, which the Lord God had planted for them; and "*out of the ground of which the Lord God had made to* "*grow every tree that was pleasant to the sight, and good for* "*food.*" Adam, therefore, had not yet been reduced to the necessity of labour. To these apparent, but necessary evils, the man and the woman respectively were now speedily to be exposed. From the beginning they had doubtless by nature been destined to these things; but peculiar circumstances had, till now, protected them from them. They are led to believe that these necessary, these inevitable evils (which lead, however, to the greatest blessings, or the highest enjoyments of life) are the penalties of their disobedience. It is thus that a wise father would inflict necessary pain or hardship on his children, and aim to turn it to their ultimate benefit. It is thus, too, that the same all-wise God, in his dispensations towards the posterity of Adam, appears to use the various trials and afflictions to which, by the nature of things, they are exposed; and all

our first parents, and to the supposed effects of that sin, in causing the fall of the whole human race, there must be *something* of truth in the generally received opinions; they have therefore only receded so far as to get rid of what appeared to them too bad to be at all defended; retaining much, of which a fuller investigation would have shewn them the absurdity; thus, although rejecting the idea of spiritual death, they say we are subjected, for Adam's offence, to mortality in this state of things; and in this they argue that there is no injustice; but to such an argument it may be suggested, in reply, that the absence of a greater injustice does not mitigate or alter the nature of a lesser injustice: if we, his posterity, should have lived for ever free from sin, and pain, and death, but for Adam's transgression, surely to lose this is no small punishment; and at the same time great injustice towards us, his innocent descendants, who are thus not only deprived of happiness, but exposed to actual suffering on his account, and in consequence of his transgression.*

Sentence being passed, Adam is immediately represented as calling his wife by the name of *Eve*, because she was (to be) the mother of all that should live;—it is probable that till the sentence of travail and pain in child bearing had been passed, this latter discovery was not made; as, from the history, it would seem that he had not previously consummated his marriage; it being said, in the next chapter, that *after* he had been turned from the garden, "*Adam knew Eve his wife, and she conceived and bare* "*Cain.*" The sentence passed, and all the previous circumstances having conspired to prepare their minds for their new and uncultivated abode, the wide world, they are further taught how to provide coverings to protect them from the weather, and other injuries to which they would now be exposed. "*Unto Adam also, and to his wife, did the Lord* "*God make*" (or probably taught Adam to make) "*coats of*

* There are a few passages in the New Testament from which the above and similar inferences have, by some commentators, been drawn;—passages which, in a future Essay, we think we shall be enabled to shew do not establish the principle in question—nay which, in some cases, bear no reference whatever to the subject; repeating, however, at this time what has been before remarked, that as the writers of the New Testament never pretended to have any other authority than the account in Genesis, and therefore on this subject do not speak by revelation—so we must explain *their* meaning by a reference to the original record, from which they draw their facts or deduce their arguments, and not the general record by their *supposed* inferences.

"*skin, and clothed them; and the Lord God said, Behold,* "*the man is become as one of us, to know good and evil.*" As though it had been said, unlike other animals, who know no difference between what is good and what is evil, they have learned, by the discipline they have gone through, this important lesson; they are now therefore fit to be left to themselves, and to the government of reason; they can distinguish what is good for food from that which is pernicious; they have also learned what is morally good or evil; they are become intelligent beings; and therefore, as compared with all other animals, have become like one of us, in our likeness and our image. The plural form is here still preserved, to keep up the idea of superior dignity in man, as though his creation, and every thing concerning him, were the result of deliberation and consultation. From the following verse, "*And now, lest he put forth his hand, and take* "*also of the tree of life, and live for ever,*" &c. it would seem evident that our first parents had, from the name given to this tree, as the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, mistakenly supposed that it possessed some physical quality or power, which produced those effects; and as it was also called the tree of life, they might have supposed it had likewise the quality of preserving life, and thus be led to return, from the unfounded expectation that by eating of it they might, contrary to what God had declared their nature to be, preserve life for ever. "*Therefore*" (it is added) "*the Lord God sent him forth from the garden of Eden,*" (in conformity with his sentence) "*to till the ground from* "*whence he was taken:*" and, to prevent his returning and acting upon the mistaken views before referred to, it is said, "*he placed at the east*" (probably the only place of entrance) "*of the garden of Eden cherubim and a flaming* "*sword, which turned every way to keep the way of the tree* "*of life.*" What was the exact nature of the guard thus placed, we are not informed; but of this we may be assured, that it was sufficiently understood by Adam, and wisely fitted to answer the purpose intended.

THE ADVANTAGES OF REVEALED RELIGION OVER NATURAL RELIGION.

[*From a Correspondent.*]

One of the arguments of Deism against revealed religion is, its asserted *inutility*. It is said that Christianity does not make known to mankind any truth that may not be discovered by the light of nature. But men are, I think, very apt to deceive themselves on this subject. Deists of the present day, many of them at least, profess to believe many truths in common with Christians; and they maintain that they have arrived at those truths by the simple operation of reason, and consequently that revelation is totally useless: but I do conceive that in arguing thus in favour of reason over revelation, they are committing an egregious error; and that the truths which they attribute to the simple exertion of the reasoning powers, are the result of the *general prevalence of the doctrines of Christianity*. For we should never forget this striking fact, that where the light of revealed religion has never extended, the truths to which I allude have never been discovered. The reason of man is the same in all ages. It was cultivated, in the highest degree, by the sages of ancient Greece and Rome, who were yet incapable of discovering the principles of revelation respecting the unity and perfections of the Deity. The utmost their reason could lead them to was perfect *atheism*. Some thought one thing, and some another. The more they reasoned, the more they were involved in perplexity and confusion. Some thought there were Gods, but they did not know how few or how many; and whether they interested themselves in the affairs of this world or not, was equally uncertain;—others thought they were revengeful, capricious, and excessively libidinous. In short, the character of their gods was more shocking and depraved than the character of the most abandoned of human beings. Reason could do but little or nothing for the ancient philosophers on these important and sublime subjects;—how is it, then, that *modern* Deists so greatly surpass the ancient sages in their views and notions of religion? This effect cannot be the result of reason. The ancients had reason,

as well as the moderns:—they exercised it, they cultivated it, they refined it; and it will not be said that the polished Greeks and Romans were men of debilitated intellects—of naturally weak capacities—of degenerated understandings. Whence, then, the superiority of modern unbelievers over the ancients? It is owing to that very revelation which some affect so deeply to despise. Wherever religion prevails, it carries the conversion of the idolator along with it. It changes the opinions of men *imperceptibly*, whether they will or not. It gradually and insensibly leavens the whole lump; and the very persons who profess to hate and to despise it, are indebted to it for all those correct ideas, which they erroneously attribute to unassisted reason—but which reason, in the absence of revelation, has never been able to discover.

But I shall now proceed one step further, and produce the particular truths to which I allude; and I shall then contend that these truths not only *were not*, in point of fact, discovered by the exercise of our natural reason, but that they *could not* be discovered by reason; and that therefore revelation has not only been greatly beneficial, but was indispensably necessary to the human race.

The first great truth which modern Deists profess to entertain, independently of revelation, is—that there is one only God. It is an almost universal opinion, even among Christians, that the belief of one God is the result of natural religion; without reflecting that men in a state of nature, however polished and refined in other respects, never did attain to it;—and I maintain that they never could attain to it. There is nothing in nature that can lead us, with certainty, to the knowledge of *one God alone*. As there are many men in the world, performing many various works, if we acknowledge any superior Being at all, should we not be led rather to infer that there were a great many ruling Gods; one to live in, and to regulate the motions and light of the sun; another to guide his consort, the moon; one to preside over the sea; another to govern the earth; and so on, till we have a god or goddess for every movement in the works of nature? And further than this, we see a mixture of (apparent at least) evil and good in this world: in one part of the earth, at one time, peace, tranquillity, and happiness; at another time, or in another place, war, pestilence, famine, or earthquakes, with all the horror and confusion attendant upon these evils. In private families, in villages, in towns, what frightful discords reign! what alarm! what dismay!

How many feel, this very moment, death,
And all the sad variety of pain;
How many sink in the devouring flood,
Or more devouring flame; how many bleed
By shameful variance betwixt man and man;
How many pine in want, and dungeon gloom,
Shut from the common air, and common use
Of their own limbs; how many drink the cup
Of baleful grief, or eat the bitter bread
Of misery. Sore pierc'd by wintry winds,
How many shrink into the sordid hut
Of cheerless poverty; how many shake
With all the fiercer tortures of the mind—
Unbounded passion, madness, guilt, remorse;—
Whence, tumbling headlong from the height of life,
They furnish matter for the tragic muse.

Amidst all this mixture of good and evil—these contradictions, and embarrassments and perplexities, will it be said that the feeble reason of man could conclude that there is but one great Mind presiding over all things? How—reason would rather object—how can good and evil both emanate from one Being? at the least there must be *two* Gods, the God of good and the God of evil—the God of happiness, and the God of misery. Men, in a state of nature, see a variety of effects continually occurring, the causes of which are invisible; hence they conclude that there are some invisible agents at work, some of which are evil, and some good; hence they have, and must have, "*Lords many and Gods* "*many*." And I maintain, that in the absence of revelation it must be so; and that the utmost the human reason can attain to, from the works of nature, is a multiplicity of Gods. "It appears to me," says Mr. Hume, "that polytheism or "idolatry was, and *necessarily must have been*, the first and "most ancient religion of mankind. It is a matter of fact, "incontestible, that *with the exception of one or two nations*, "all mankind were polytheists. The further we mount up "into antiquity, the more do we find mankind plunged into "polytheism. No marks, no symptoms of any more perfect "religion. The most ancient records of human race still "present us with that system, as the popular and established "creed. The north, the south, the east, the west, give "their unanimous testimony to the same fact. And as to "our present experience, the savage tribes of America, "Africa, and Asia, are all idolators;—not a single excep-"tion to this rule." So far Mr. Hume: and I will observe, that without going among the savage tribe, we find a wonderful propensity among the poor of the civilized parts of

the world, to superstitious belief. Any unusual appearance, or occurrence, alarms by its novelty, and leads them to attribute it to some invisible being, spirit, or ghost. Such is the religion of nature—" the primitive religion of un-" instructed mankind!" What, then, becomes of the boasted wisdom of modern Deists? They owe it all to that revelation which, being diffused all around them, has imperceptibly instructed them in the knowledge of those truths which, though reason could not discover, their reason approves of, after they have been revealed to them.

But if it were possible for one individual or two, by long and diligent study, to come to the conclusion that there is only one Supreme Being, yet this knowledge could be of no use to the discoverer—he could proceed no further; he could not ascertain the extent of the divine knowledge, power, or goodness. He could not say whether this Being made the world, or whether the world existed from eternity; whether the effects of nature are under his controul, or whether they are the results of certain laws or principles which have existed from eternity, independently of the power of this Deity. He could not determine whether this Being interests himself at all in human concerns, or whether he reposes in a state of tranquillity and perfect indifference. Revelation teaches that *God knows our thoughts;* and that he hears the secret prayers even of his children—that he is a Being " *that trieth the reins and the heart.*" What is there in *nature* that can lead any mind to the discovery of this great truth, the most important in the book of Christianity; a truth, the consideration of which leads us to that strict sincerity of heart which men of the world, and hypocrites in religion, never regard; and which, it will hardly be supposed, can influence the even conscientious unbeliever? Revelation teaches that God can direct all things into what channel he pleases; that nothing happens without his permission; that he can make, and unmake; that he can give sight to the blind, or take it away from those who possess it; that he can destroy life, and restore it again; and, in short, that there is no limits to his power. But what is there *in nature* that can lead any mind, however strong or penetrating, to these important conclusions? and did any mind, unassisted and uninstructed by revelation, ever arrive at these truths? On the contrary, we find nothing but the most wretched and absurd systems among those who studied the works of nature, to find out God. The more they studied the subject, the more they were involved in horrible imaginations,

and in darkness, that might be felt. Their system of morals, too, was so depraved, that it cannot be named among Christians. This was the effect of their ignorance of God: and I maintain, that the great and only object of revelation was, and is, to make men know the *existence* and *nature* of God; and his future intentions to those who obey, and to those who disobey him;—and I further maintain, that no human mind *ever did*, or *ever could* arrive at this knowledge, unassisted by revelation; and therefore this revelation was absolutely necessary to the happiness of mankind. Whether men attend to it or not—whether they make a happy use of it, or pervert it to the worst of purposes, is another question, which has nothing to do with this fact, that it was necessary to make known to us the existence and attributes of the Deity. There is no *medium* between atheism and christianity. Some profess to believe in a God without assistance from religion—but it is evident they are deceived. They owe their belief to the *prevalence* of that religion—they owe it to education. The unanimous testimony of all history is against any other conclusion. There are others who profess at once to be atheists. These are the most consistent. Rejecting revelation, they find themselves under the necessity of being atheists—or sceptics at most.

It appears that the first inhabitants of this earth were taught the existence of God by God himself. As mankind increased and separated, and spread in different directions, they carried with them this great truth; but being left to themselves, and seeing innumerable effects, whose causes they were not able to discover, they fell into idolatry; and when once they began to make invisible agents, there would be no end to the number of them: every river, every grove, every star, and every faculty of the mind would have its deity. But they still retained the belief of one Supreme Being, who was the God of gods. In the Grecian mythology Jupiter is acknowledged for the greatest of all the gods; and is styled by Homer king, or father of gods and men. The Hindoos also believe in the Supreme Being who existed from all eternity; they then add, that he resolved to produce other gods, some male and some female:—and when once men had given way to their imaginations, there was no end to their monstrous inventions. The Jews alone were preserved from these dreadful evils by the interposition of the Deity himself. But if we do not admit that the Jews were instructed by God—or in other words, if we do not admit the general truth of their history, then how can we account

for the indisputable fact that they were preserved from idolatry, and all its impure rites, at a time when all other nations, and those nations infinitely superior to the Hebrews in all other respects, were plunged into the depths of the most horrible superstition.

Sandon, near Royston. G. G. F.

THE RESURRECTION FROM THE DEAD OPPOSED TO THE DOCTRINE OF THE IMMORTALITY OF THE SOUL.

ESSAY V.—THE SCRIPTURAL EVIDENCE.

"All those fine spun notions of the immateriality of the soul, and all the artificial deductions from that principle, teach nothing but the art of blowing scholastic bubbles, which will certainly go peaceably to their rest, without the least detriment, either to sound learning or true religion."—*Archdeacon Blackburn.*

THE first department of our scriptural examination of the present subject we concluded in our last number; that which will occupy the present Essay, will form the *second* division; namely, that the apostles of Jesus, on some occasions, appear to sanction, by their language, a belief in the doctrine of the immortality of the soul; and while the passages which are assumed to aid this position are not numerous, they are yet deemed by our opponents to possess rather a formidable character; such an estimation of them, however, is caused principally by the disregard of a rule which is indispensible in scriptural, or indeed in any other criticism—that of viewing literal expressions as such, and figurative ones as figurative, and at all times allowing plain and definite passages to illustrate those which may be, from various causes, less so; thus to ensure, in all obscure or controverted cases, the best exposition of such by a reference to the work itself. The applicability of these remarks to our subject, will be seen upon a reference to the New Testament, in which the principles and genius of the christian religion are often designated as "LIFE" or "SPIRIT;" and such as embraced the advantages connected with that system, are

said to to have "*passed from death*" (a state of condemnation) "*unto life,*" (a state of pardon) "*from the power or* "*influence of Satan*" (of worldly pursuits or principles) "*unto* "*God;*" of the principles which Jesus delivered, it is said, "*they are spirit and they are life.*" (John vi. 63.) And to those who embraced such, there was "*now no con-* "*demnation to them which are in Christ Jesus,*" (in christianity) "*who walk not after the flesh,*" (the principles of the world) "*but after the spirit;*" (principles of christianity,) Rom. viii. 1. The power of man is also contrasted with that of God—the one, it is shewn, may destroy our present existence, but that God, besides that, can also "take away" the hopes and rewards of the gospel; thus, the apostles of Jesus are exhorted not to fear man, whose greatest effort could only destroy their body, or present life; but rather to fear him, whose power extended equally over their future, as well as their present existence; and who, besides annihilating their body, could likewise withhold that future life (or soul) which the gospel had promised to them, and over which, man's power and influence could not extend. Thus, also, in the free use of figurative language, Jesus exclaims to the multitude, "*Verily, verily, I* "*say unto you, except ye eat the flesh of the son of man and* "*drink his blood, ye have no life* (no spirit) *in you; whoso eateth* "*my flesh and drinketh my blood hath eternal life; whoso eateth* "*me, even he shall live by me.*" (John vi.) It is clearly here the principles of christianity, which they were exhorted to eat and to drink; and which, by such eating and drinking, believers (and *believers alone*) had then *within them* the "*life,*" or "*spirit,*" thus designated. So also the apostle Paul, when writing to the Corinthian church, at a time when it was disordered both in discipline and morals, addresses its members as "*God's husbandry; ye are God's* "*building, ye are the temple of God—the* SPIRIT OF GOD "*dwelleth* IN YOU." And the same writer still more strongly urges upon them, that they should flee from every sin, and that they should bend all their energies to the performance of the will of God, because their "*body was* "*not for fornication, but for the Lord, and the Lord* "*for the body—what, know ye not that your bodies are* "*members of Christ?*" And therefore purity, as well as perfect devotedness to godly principle, both of their "souls," "minds" and "bodies," (i. e. the whole of their energies) was indispensable; thus using for the purpose of increased impressiveness, a mode of amplification frequent in the

scriptures, as in the instance of Jesus when explaining to the lawyer that to love God was the greatest commandment, he adopts this beautiful and forcible mode of expression, "*Thou shalt love the Lord thy God, with all thy heart, "with all thy* SOUL, *with all thy mind, and with all thy "strength,*"—that is, with a perfect devotedness of mind; and not as our adversaries, were they consistent, would and must contend, that they were firstly, to love God with all their *hearts;* secondly, with all their *souls;* thirdly, with all their *minds;* and fourthly, with all their *strength;* which, though distinct and independent of each other, were yet "parts and parcels" of the same man; and, in addition also to such inevitable consequences, resulting from the avowed principles of immaterialism, we contend, that if because of the occurrence of the mere words "*soul*" and "*body,*" even in the admitted instance of the description being of but *one* and the *same person,* that we are therefore, and as a matter of necessity, to allow that there are *two* natures in man; then we hold, that, in addition to the cases already quoted, and upon the same principles of scripture criticism, Paul teaches not two but *three* natures; for he acquaints the Thessalonians that he "*prays God your whole* SPIRIT—*and* SOUL—*and "*BODY *be preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord "Jesus Christ:*" (1 Thess. v. 23) so that here we submit, the hypothesis of our adversaries is materially weakened, and that too, upon their own shewing; for if this and similar passages, are of weight to them in the present controversy, they can only be esteemed so by their consistency with that which they are brought to support; but it is evident, that, if they prove anything for that doctrine, they prove too much, by dividing man, not into two, but three distinct natures, a BODY—SOUL—and SPIRIT. Other most important passages too, of Paul's exhortations and reasonings, must, if the interpretation of our opponents be admitted, suffer a like perversion, so that believers at Corinth must have had literally *within* them the Holy Ghost, (which the same parties tell us is a part of the Godhead,) "*for your bodies "are the temples of the Holy Ghost*"—(*Holy Spirit,* referring to the possession of spiritual gifts, which, in the apostolic age, were conferred *only* upon *believers;* and, in connection with such gifts, what may be esteemed the "*fruits of the "spirit,*" or devotion of mind to christian principles was that "spirit," or "life," or "soul," which *they* possessed) "*WHICH IS IN YOU, which ye have of God, for you are not "your own, you are bought with a price; therefore, glorify God "IN YOUR BODY, and IN YOUR SPIRIT, which are God's:*"

(in your whole mind and character.) 1 Cor. vi. Here the consistent immaterialist, who claims support for his doctrine merely because the word "*soul*" occurs in the common translation, will not receive aid from the Apostle: glorify God *in your body*, that gross, inert, sluggish matter, which is incapable either of life or thought, and this body, too, is God's. This they would and must contend is inadmissable; and even Mr. Abernethy, though aided by the Christian Advocate, would find it difficult to reconcile it with that doctrine, which was taught by "Socrates, Plato, and a host "of others," and which *they*, as christians, "glory" in defending; it is, however, strictly scriptural, in idea as well as in expression, and in strict correspondence with the language of Jesus (as recorded by Matthew) to his apostles, when he was about to send them forth to proclaim the gospel amid persecution and privation, and to aid them in enduring which, they were exhorted not to fear man, but to fear God, who had power equally over their present and future life. "*Fear not them that kill the body but are not able* "*to kill the soul,*" (kill "the life"—the future life; the conferring or the withholding of which must exclusively be an act of almighty power) "*but fear him which is able to* "*destroy both body and soul in hell,*" (the grave.*) Matt. x. 28.

This exhortation so suited *to* and required *by* the parties to whom it was addressed, occurs at that period of the mission of Jesus, when he had selected his twelve disciples; and, having given them power to perform miracles, they were sent forth as "*sheep in the midst of wolves;*" and they were to beware of men, for such would deliver them up unto the councils, and "*they will scourge you in their* "*synagogues; ye shall be brought before governors and kings* "*for my sake, but when they deliver you up, take no thought how* "*or what ye shall speak,* FOR IT SHALL BE GIVEN TO YOU "IN THE SAME HOUR WHAT YE SHALL SPEAK, *for it is not* "*ye that speak,* BUT THE SPIRIT OF THE FATHER WHICH "SPEAKETH IN YOU; *but when they persecute you in one* "*city, flee ye into another, fear them not, for he that loseth* "*his life for my sake shall find it.*" (See Matt. x.—Luke xii.)

---

* HELL, "In Hebrew *scheol*, this word most commonly signifies the grave." Cruden's Concordance, article Hell. "The word *Hell* is of Saxon extraction, "and signifies *a covered place;* from the same original we still retain, in our "language, the word heal, or *hele*, which signifies *to cover over.*" Rees' Cyclopedia, article Hell. "It is certain that the Greek word we render Hell "does properly signify no more than a place that is withdrawn from our view." Goadby's Bible, note on Luke xvi. 23.

That is, he that loseth his present life in propagating my principles, shall find another life in the future which man cannot destroy: therefore, fear not them whose utmost power is thus so defined and circumscribed; and partly in correspondence with these views those who possessed the principles of Jesus, and the hopes consequent upon them, are considered as having that "*within*" them which is *spirit*, or *soul*, or *life*; for "*THE WORDS THAT I SPEAK UNTO YOU* "*THEY ARE SPIRIT AND THEY ARE LIFE*;" therefore, fear him only, whose power can at once annihilate your present life, and also that spiritual life which consists in and is built upon christian principles and hopes. The whole scope and object of the address of Jesus being to direct them to proclaim the approach of the Messiah's kingdom—to apprize them of the persecutions, and perhaps even death, which would await them in their ministry; and, at the same time, to give them the strongest encouragement to persevere, for that the divine Being was their guide and protector; that their labours and privations were taken cognizance of by him, and that every thing in creation being so under his superintendance, that even a sparrow did not fall to the ground without his knowledge; they therefore were to rely upon God; to confess Jesus before men, in order that he might confess them before his Father, which was in heaven; consequently they were to bear with every privation and suffering, not fearing man, whose utmost malignity and wickedness could only inflict present evil, but to fear him who possessed a power which no human means could reach, that of causing all their hopes to terminate in the grave. That these are faithful representations of the character and object of this memorable address of Jesus is further supported by the corresponding passage in Luke, in which all the points important to the case are related, and yet neither the word *soul*, nor the destruction of that soul "*in hell*," do there occur. "*Be not afraid of them that kill the body, and after* "*that have no more that they can do; but I will forewarn you* "*whom ye shall fear; fear him, which after he hath killed,* "*hath power to cast into hell;*" (the grave) "*yea, I say unto* "*you, fear him.*" (Luke xii. 4.) And let it be observed, that this was an address to the apostles *only*, for neither the multitude nor the *unbelieving* Jews were at any time recognized as being in a situation to receive, or appreciate this "*life*" or "*soul.*" We may remark too, in passing, that the very terms of this address strictly accord with the *materiality—the mortality* of the frame of man; and that, according to the theory of our opponents, the *soul*

does not "descend to the grave," so that we may well leave *them* to explain how that can be *killed* which is inherently immortal; besides which, as the admitted object of the address was to encourage the apostles to bear up against every evil that man had the power to inflict, it could supply no motive for them to be warned to fear him who could destroy their soul in the grave; for, if the doctrine of immaterialism be scriptural, the soul never is deposited in the grave—it cannot be destroyed there—being, in fact, according to the definition of the immaterialist, *indestructible*; and it must be understood, even of the power of Deity, that he could as easily destroy himself, as that which is inherently, and in its own nature, immortal. So that, whatever obscurity may have appertained to this passage, it is clearly chargeable upon the translators for using the term soul; and that too without regard to their own consistancy: for, in a case precisely similar, they faithfully render into English a corresponding address of Jesus, "*Take no thought* "*for your life, what ye shall eat, or what ye shall drink; nor* "*for your body, what ye shall put on, IS NOT YOUR LIFE*" (the same word rendered soul in other passages) "*more* "*than meat and your body than raiment.*" (Matt. vi. 25.) With this understanding of the terms *life* or *soul* or *spirit*, we can discover no difficulty in the preceding cases, nor in the expressions of Jesus. "*If any man will come after me let* "*him deny himself, and take up his cross and follow me: for* "*whosoever will save his life, shall lose it;*" (that is, whosoever would rather save his present life than forfeit it in the cause of christianity, will lose the solid confidence in a future life) "*and whosoever will lose his life for my sake, shall find it, for* "*what is a man profited if he gain the whole world and lose his* "*own soul?*" (lose that future *life* before promised to those, who could, if necessary, sacrifice even their present life for, in the words of Mark, "*my sake and the gospel's*") "*or what shall* "*a man give in exchange for his soul?*" (Matt. xvi. 24. to 26.) But had Jesus in this address had any view towards the doctrine of an immortal soul, and were we compelled to follow the common translation, how singularly out of place would have been his reasonings, if the immortality and independent existence of the soul be the doctrine of the gospel; and that it is not so, at least in this oft-quoted passage, is clear, from the conclusion of the observations of Jesus as recorded by Mark, which are distinct and forcible in shewing that the "soul" here spoken of is not an immaterial principle, but is the gift of a future life.—"*For whosoever shall lose* "*his life for my sake and the gospel's, the same shall save it;*

"*and whosoever shall be ashamed of me and my words, of him* "*shall the son of man be ashamed when he cometh in the glory* "*of the Father with all his holy angels;*" (messengers) (Mark viii. 35, 38) the whole being in connection with the address to the apostles, at the time when Jesus began to shew them that he must "*go unto Jeursalem and suffer many things of* "*the elders and chief priests and scribes, and be killed and be* "*raised again the third day;*" (Matt. xvi. 21.) when Peter rebuked him, saying, "*be it far from thee, Lord.*" Jesus, therefore, proceeds, as in the verses before quoted, to condemn the fears of the apostles, shewing them that if they would "come after" him, to "deny" themselves, to "take up their cross and follow him," and even be prepared to lay down their lives, if they desired and "longed" for future existence. Well, indeed, might Jesus exclaim, what is a man profitted if he gain the whole world and lose the assurance of such inestimable blessings?

We turn to some minor passages in the writings of the apostles in which the salvation of souls is spoken of, but in a different sense to that of those which we have referred to, though equally requiring explanation. James, in addressing the "twelve tribes scattered abroad," exhorts them to be perfect and entire, wanting nothing, and if any wanted knowledge they were to "*ask of God who giveth to all men* "*liberally;*" but to obtain that for which they asked, it was essential that they should lay apart "*all filthiness and super-* "*fluity of naughtiness, and receive with meekness the engrafted* "*word which is able to save*" (deliver) "*your souls.*" (deliver your persons—deliver you.) James i. 21. The apostle is not here addressing the twelve tribes upon *future* salvation, but in regard to *deliverance* from that state of death or condemnation under which the Jews laboured, and from which they could only be emancipated by faith (belief) in the gospel. In a corresponding sense Peter calls to the minds of the christians to whom he wrote, that they *had received*, not *were* to receive, the "*salvation of their souls,*" a deliverance not communicated *to* nor possessed *by* but "searched diligently" after by the prophets. "*Yet believing, ye rejoice with joy* "*unspeakable and full of glory, receiving the end of your faith* (belief) "*even the salvation*" (deliverance) "*of your souls,*" (of your persons—of yourselves) "*of which salvation the prophets* "*have enquired and searched diligently.*" (1 Peter i. 8, 9, 10.) And it is essential to be remarked that *believers* alone were those who had received this salvation, and that not from natural but from moral death, or a state of condemnation; then it is said, those who in times past "*had walked according to the*

"*course of this world, and* YOU *hath he quickened who were d*
"*in trespasses and sins;*" (Ephes. ii. 1) and it should seem fr
the disorders in the Corinthian church, that, at least for a
son, they had failed to appreciate their deliverance, for
was commonly reported that "*among them there was*
"*iniquity as was not even named among the gentiles;*" and Pa
though "*absent in body but present in spirit,*" (in mind)
judged of him that had so done this deed, "*deliver such a*
"*unto satan for the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit*
"*be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus.*" (1 Cor. v. 5.) Fr
this passage it has been contended, that "there is a spi
distinct from the material man, which will be saved;"
this case, however, as in every other of real or assum
difficulty, the scriptures themselves supply the best exp
nation, and from them it will appear that the incestious
dividual in question, was to be excluded from communi
with the Corinthian church. This exclusion it was whi
constituted the delivering unto satan—(or the world)—that th
destruction of the flesh was not, as the immaterialist co
tends, the "destruction of the material man," but that
the evil *principles* and *practices* of the flesh, as contrast
with those of christianity which are the spirit here spok
of, they being pure and spiritual; and which principles a
farther illustrated and enlarged upon in the writings of th
same apostle to the church at Rome, "*There is therefor*
"*now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus,*" (in
christianity) "*who walk not after the flesh but after th*
"*spirit: for they that are after the flesh do mind the things of*
"*the flesh, but they that are after the spirit, the things of th*
"*spirit;* BUT YE ARE NOT IN THE FLESH, BUT IN THE
"SPIRIT, *if so be that the* SPIRIT *of God dwell in you; now if*
"*any man have not the* SPIRIT *of Christ*" (of christianity) "*he*
"*is none of his.*" (Romans viii. 1, &c.) Upon these and similar passages, no ordinary share of ingenuity has been exerted to convert them into an avowal, on the part of the apostles, that man has within him an immortal soul; we, however, from the preceding explanations, submit that they bear no reference thereto, and that their distinct scope and tendency clearly discountenance that doctrine.

We now pass on to those passages, which embrace Paul's wishes to leave this "*earthly tabernacle;*" that of the transfiguration; and the assertion of Jesus, that "*God is not the God of the dead, but of the living;*" the whole of which, together with other similar passages, are with much confidence advanced by our opponents. In regard to the first, we at once admit that such were Paul's

sires, and we are prepared to submit the evidence upon which such desires were probably and rationally founded; pelling, as his mind must have done, on the divine conduct wards those of his predecessors, who had been faithful and voted servants of God, as in the cases of Enoch, Elijah, d Jesus, who were favoured with an immediate futurity, d the cause of their being so honoured clearly resulted om their faithful performance of the divine will, which ould thus act as a reward *to them* on the one hand, and a imulus to others who were divinely commissioned to follow their footsteps; so that, although in the instances of Abraam, Isaac, Jacob and Moses, we have only the evidence f probability that they were blessed with an immediate esurrection, we yet feel strongly inclined to favour that pinion. Of Moses, indeed, the fact of his appearing with Elijah to Jesus in the "Holy mount," is strongly calculated o aid the opinion that he was numbered among those who were immediately "clothed" upon with immortality. Paul, therefore, knowing of the existence of Enoch, Elijah, and Jesus, and if the other prophets of God were also then in existence, doubtless he with equal certainty was acquainted therewith; added to which, as all the apostles had to perform a very extraordinary and self-devoted part in the establishment of christianity, and they had received upon several occasions divine communications, it would seem to correspond with the conduct of God towards their predecessors, and the principles of his general government, that *they* also, if they continued equally faithful unto the end, should be made partakers of the like privilege; with, therefore, these ideas in our minds, we recur to the statement of the sufferings which Paul and his fellow apostles endured, as recorded in the Corinthians, "*We are troubled on every side, yet not distressed; "perplexed, but not in despair; persecuted, but not forsaken; cast "down, but not destroyed; always bearing about in the body the "dying of the Lord Jesus: we are confident and willing to be "absent from the body and present with the Lord;*" (2 Cor. iv. & v.) And, in the Philippians, the same apostle's earnest expectation and hope is, that Christ should be magnified in his body, "*for to me to live is Christ, and to die "is gain; for I am in a strait betwixt two, having a desire to "depart and to be with Christ which is far better.*" (Phil. i.) Such being the passages which are construed as before stated, we submit that the expression of a wish "*to be "present with the Lord,*" or a "*desire to depart to be with "Christ,*" so far from according with immaterialism, really

discountenances that doctrine; for if he had been animated by an immortal soul, then all such objects were secured to him, and that not by the favour of God, but by having that within him which was *naturally* immortal. Besides these considerations, it should seem probable from two memorable facts in the life of Jesus, as recorded by John, (the first of which is an address to the apostles, after what is termed the last supper; and the other that of his prayer to God for them) which tend strongly to support the view of an *exception* being made in *their* instances and of their being honoured with an immediate resurrection. "*Let not your hearts* "*be troubled ye believers in God, believe also in me; in my* "*father's house are many mansions, if it were not so, I would* "*have told you,* I GO TO PREPARE A PLACE FOR YOU." (John xiv.) "*As thou hast sent me into the world, even so* "*have I also sent them into the world, and the glory which* "*thou gavest me, I have given them; Father I will that they* "*also whom thou hast given me,* BE WITH ME WHERE I AM, "*that they may behold my glory which thou hast given me.*" (John xvii. 24.) Combining, therefore, these several views, the most rational conclusion in our judgment is, that the apostles, together with the prophets, were thus *exclusively* distinguished; and although Paul did not, at the time when this address and prayer were delivered, form a part of their body, yet he was when converted, and also afterwards, in communication with Jesus who appeared unto him, and, doubtless, he partook with the eleven of their high and distinguished rewards; so that Paul's desires, while they give no countenance to immaterialism, appear to rest upon a solid basis, and they harmonize with and give consistency to the address and the prayer of Jesus, either of which are irreconcileable with the doctrine of the immortality of the soul, for, in addition to its incompatability with the whole scope of these passages, the belief in it by Paul, would constitute his anxiety to depart a mere impatience of life; for if he had within him an immortal soul, then, as an inevitable consequence, he was certain of an immediate re-existence, and that too by a principle possessed by him, merely in common with every other human being, and, consequently, not capable of operating upon his mind, or that of the other apostles, as a privilege of a *peculiar and exclusive* character; as one which could administer support to them under their sufferings, and impel them on to make every sacrifice and exertion.

The conversion of the apostle Paul, as well as his anxiety

to be with Christ, is, with palpable inconsistency, held to support the doctrine of our opponents; to meet which, we refer to the facts as related by himself, which, it will be seen, are confined to a statement of the exalted nature of the communication with which he had been favoured, and that too, in a *vision*: "*I knew a man in Christ about fourteen* "*years ago, whether in the body, I cannot tell; or whether out* "*of the body, I cannot tell: God knoweth; such a one was* "*caught up into the third heaven.*" We stop at this passage just to remark, that this relation is stated by the apostle at its commencement, to be "*a vision of the Lord:*" and we shall content ourselves, merely with putting a few questions to those writers who labour in support of their hypothesis, to prove its truth, even from a *vision;* we ask them, if we are literally to take this passage, that Paul, at his conversion, was really in, what they understand by the third heaven? Can "gross," "sluggish," "medullary matter," be an inhabitant of heaven? for, to maintain literal consistency of explanation, it might have been so; as Paul states, that he does not know whether he was not there "*in the body:*" on the other hand, if he literally was in the third heaven "*out of the body,*" we ask, where was the body during the period? and, as it is quite certain it was not dead, we further ask, what becomes of the immaterial doctrine, which maintains, that it is the soul alone which gives *life* to the body, and that when the soul is removed from the body the latter becomes a mass of dead matter.

A similar perversion of a passage, in its own nature plain and definite, and requiring no common powers of mystification to pervert, occurs in most of the writings of the scriptural defenders of immaterialism—among others, Dr. Jortin asserts, that the words of Jesus, (Matt. xxii. 32) "*God is not the God of the dead but of the living,*" were words spoken by our Saviour, with a view to establish the doctrine of the soul's immortality." (19th Sermon, vol. ii.) A reference, however, to the connexion which gave rise to the remarks in question, will probably be the best mode of ascertaining their correct meaning: it appears that the Sadduces, who denied that there would be any resurrection, put a question to Jesus in support of their opinions, to which he replied, "*Ye do err, not knowing the scriptures, nor the* "*power of God; for, as touching the resurrection of the dead,* "*have ye not read that which was spoken unto you by God,* "*saying, I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac,* "*and the God of Jacob? God is not the God of the dead,*

"*but of the living.*" (Matt. xxii. 29, &c.) Here both the question and the reply is distinctly, and to the exclusion of every other subject, "*the resurrection of the dead.*" We may also remark in addition, that the parties who put the question to Jesus, not only denied a resurrection, but also said, "*that there is neither Angels or Spirits:*" it consequently must be apparent, that had Jesus been a teacher of the doctrines of angels and spirits, and more especially, if such doctrines bore that relation to the resurrection which immaterialists aver, then the Sadduces would have naturally availed themselves of so favourable an opportunity to attempt to puzzle Jesus; and it is inconceivable that he should not have advanced such as evidence of the doctrine of a future life, and then his reply, in that case, must have been to this effect, "*Ye do err, not knowing the* "*scriptures; for have ye not read that you have an immortal* "*soul within you which cannot die?*" But passing on to the point in regard to the Deity being—not the God of the dead but of the living, and that "*the dead are raised,* "*even Moses shewed at the bush when he called the Lord, the* "*God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob.*" (Luke xx. 38.) Upon this we would remark: *first,* that the mortality of the *whole man,* consequently his materiality, is here distinctly avowed; and also, that if we have an immortal soul, then we can know nothing of a resurrection, which is a re-living—a re-existence; for, as the soul cannot die, *it,* as a consequence, cannot "rise from the dead." *Secondly,* that Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, either have risen or must rise, or else the expression of Jesus cannot be justified; and that we incline to the former opinion will be seen in our remarks connected with the apostle Paul; but if the latter be esteemed more correct, it will equally support in this passage, that, for which we contend, and scripturally correspond with the expression, that "*God is not the God of* "*the dead but of the living,*" i. e. of those who will hereafter be raised to life, and who are now spoken of as living in the view and decree of God. (See notes in Unitarian Version on this passage.) Thus, according with an illustration in the Romans in connection with Paul's argument, to prove that Abraham is the father of all believers, "*As it is written, (I have* "*made thee a father of many nations) even God who quickeneth* "*the dead and* CALLETH THOSE THINGS WHICH BE NOT" (i. e. have not yet, but are in the determined council and foreknowledge of God designed to take place) "AS THOUGH "THEY WERE." (Rom. iv. 17.) "Who regards the future

"resurrection as if it were present." (See Grotius and Beza.) Thus upon either view of the case, whether Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob *be* living or *are to* live, we submit, that Dr. Jortin's conclusion is unsupported; and that the words of Jesus, so far from proving, *dis*prove the doctrine of the soul's immortality. Under the same division of this controversy, our opponents rank, what is denominated the Transfiguration, and from thence assume the very point in debate, which it is of importance to keep in mind, is not—whether or not there will be a future state of existence, (such a state being admitted on both sides) but that we contend on the one hand, that the scriptures place the evidence upon which it is founded upon one ground, and the immaterialists upon another; and they select that one, which is alike independent of both the Old and New Testaments, being solely borrowed from the heathen philosophy. Consistently, therefore, with such a theory, a writer before quoted, claims in support of his system, the appearance to Jesus of Moses and Elias, for "the Evangelist informs us, '*Moses and Elias* "'*came and conversed with Jesus, and were seen and heard by* "'*those disciples who were present: as to Elias he died not, but* "'*like Enoch before him was taken up into heaven; but of* "'*Moses it is written that he died and was buried.*' This "account, therefore, is a fair intimation that good men "continue to live and to act after they are released from "this mortal body." (Dr. Jortin's Sermons, p. 385.) But to have made the Doctor's case a good one, it should have been related, that it was the *immortal souls* of Moses and Elias which conversed with Jesus. The qualities of which souls, be it remembered, are defined to be by nature aërial and immaterial, consequently, not tangible to the touch, nor visible to the sight; yet, in despite of such *inherent* properties, the Doctor admits that they "*were* SEEN *and* "HEARD *by those desciples who were present.*" With regard to the Transfiguration itself, there are two views taken of it: one, that it was a vision; the other, that Moses and Elias did personally appear to Jesus on the holy mount; and whichever view of the transaction be the correct one, they alike fail in assisting the immaterial doctrine. For if it was a personal appearance, it proves no more than this: That the distinguished messengers of God have been *exclusively* honoured with a continuation of existence; and it establishes the point, that if there are spirits, their properties are inconsistent with what is ascribed to them by the immaterialist. If, on the other hand, it was a visionary ap-

pearance the immaterialist must concede, that a communication by vision has no kind of connection with the existence of spirits, the relation being, that "*Jesus took up with him,* "*Peter, and John, and James into a mountain to pray, and* "*behold there talked with him* TWO MEN" (not two spirits) "*which were Moses and Elias, who appeared in glory, and* "*spake of his decease which he should accomplish at Jerusalem.*" (Luke ix. 28.) And doubtless, such a communication was designed for, and must have succeeded in, administering to the mind of Jesus, under all his subsequent exertions and sufferings, the most effectual support. The effect too upon the apostles, would seem to have been very important, "*For we have not followed cunningly devised fables, when we* "*made known unto yon the power and coming of our Lord Jesus* "*Christ, but were eye-witnesses of his majesty; and the voice* "*which came from heaven we heard when we were with him in* "*the holy mount.*" (2 Peter i. 16, &c.) In regard to the cases of Enoch, Elijah, and Jesus, we shall content ourselves with a very brief statement, being satisfied, that a literal quotation of the historical records will clearly destroy the arguments of the immaterialist. Of Enoch, it appears, that his days "*Were three hundred, sixty, and five years, and Enoch* "*walked with God,*" (i. e. obeyed the will of God, walked in obediance to and had full confidence in God, "led a "godly life," "was well pleasing to God,." See Geddes' Translation and notes.) "*he was not, for God took* HIM" (not his soul) "*away.*" (Gen. v. 23, 24.) Of Elijah, it is related, that when walking with Elisha, that "HE" (not his immortal soul) "*went up into heaven.*" (the air) (2 Kings, ii. 11, &c.) And of Jesus, that when he had ended instructing his apostles, and he "*had spoken these things,* "*while they beheld,* HE" (not an immaterial spirit) "*was* "*taken up, and a cloud received* HIM" (not his soul) "*out* "*of their sight.*" (Acts i. 9.) Now, if futurity can only be entered upon by immaterial spirits "when released from "this mortal body," we ask, how, or by what means can it be accounted for, that the Bible historians should have omitted to state so important a fact; and that, also, in three most memorable cases, when the relation was inseparable from a faithful narrative? But, in addition to this circumstance, when we follow out Jortin's position to its conclusion, it will be seen, that, if we are animated by an immortal spirit, he himself is the opponent of his own doctrine, by which, if it be true, not merely Enoch and Elijah, and "other good men continue to live and to act," but *all* men

without distinction or discrimination, alike and immediately continue to live and to act when "released from this mortal "body," and that, too, without regard to the declaration of Jesus, that "*a time will come*" (not *now is*, or as yet ever has been) "*when all that are in their graves, shall hear the* "*voice of the son of God and come forth; they that have done* "*good to the resurrection of life, and they that have done evil* "*to the resurrection of damnation* (condemnation). (John v. 28, 29.)

The only remaining points which come under the present branch of our investigation, are those, which were incidentally glanced at in a former Essay, relating to the belief (at least on the part of some) of the apostles in the existence of spirits, and the fact that Jesus did not expressly and specifically correct such impressions. To rightly appreciate this argument, it is necessary that we should recur to the situation of Jesus and to the *distinct objects* for the declaration of which he was commissioned, they being those of first announcing the fulfilment of the divine promises towards man—of removing the ceremonial parts of the Mosaic institution—of proclaiming forgiveness of sins upon repentance—of preparing men for the enlargement of that church which should know neither Jew nor Greek, and which should cause all nations of the earth to be blessed; and of announcing that there would be a future state of existence:—these were the mighty and all-important facts which the Jewish Messiah was commissioned to proclaim; we are, therefore, not to look to his teachings as to an Encyclopedia, neither are we to expect from them that to which they lay no claim. A revelation from Deity of the comprehensive kind referred to, would, indeed, have been inconsistent with the developement of intellect and individual exertion, to excite which ever appears characteristic of the divine government; besides which, the communications enumerated above could not fail to establish in the minds of believers conceptions so definite, and principles so correct, that minor points of ignorance would necessarily vanish as the mind gained strength in the express doctrines of revelation. In addition to these views, Jesus, in the use of popular language, had really no choice; and it will be seen that, upon the admission that his object was to be understood by those whom he addressed, the present case is of a similar description to that of his curing maniacal and epileptical diseases, such being supposed by the Jewish people to be caused by the afflicted parties having within them evil

spirits. When such persons were restored to health, it was said that he "*cast out*" the possessing demon, and, upon some occasions, his own words are, "*I command thee to come out;*" yet even by the enlightened immaterialist these words, which accord so expressly with the erroneous doctrines of demoniacal possessions, are most correctly viewed, not as teaching such opinions, but merely as being the unavoidable use of the language of his age and country. We might also notice, as further illustrative of this point, that in our own times, in which, from their greater enlightment, the use of words originating in popular ignorance might be supposed easy to be dispensed with; yet even now our astronomers speak and write of the sun's *rising* and *setting*, and their meaning is not misunderstood by any, although their words (in the necessity of using which they have no choice) express the exact reverse of what they believe and teach. The same use of popular forms of expression occur, when Jesus went to his disciples after his resurrection; they, in common with most of the Jews as well as Heathens, believed in "*angels and* "*spirits*" and "*they were terrified and affrighted and sup-* "*posed they had seen a spirit.*" To have entered into a discussion with them for the purpose of correcting their superstitious opinions in this particular would have been an abortive and unprofitable effort; besides which it would have diverted their minds from the chief point, such being to place beyond doubt the fact, that he was the same Jesus who had been crucified; and this is at once effected, not by discussions upon the absurdities connected with spirits, and demons, and ghosts, but by meeting them on *their own ground*, and making a reply, which to *them* was unanswerable; "*and he said unto them, why are ye troubled, and why doth* "*thoughts arise in your hearts, behold my hands and my feet* "*that it is I myself, handle me and see, for a spirit hath not flesh* "*and bones as ye see me have;*" and when he had thus spoken, he shewed them his hands and his feet; by this course his object was instantly gained, for he "*opened their understandings* "*that they might understand the scriptures; that thus it behoved* "*Christ to suffer and to rise from the dead the third day; that* "*repentance and remission of sins should be proclaimed unto all* "*nations beginning at Jerusalem, and ye are witnesses of these* "*things;*" so that, in calmly viewing the use of popular phraseology on the part of Jesus, it appears to us that he had no choice; he must either have done so, or else have been silent; besides which, the difference will readily be admitted, between

referring to an opinion and *adopting* it; for, in truth, if Jesus, on this occasion, taught and sanctioned the heathen doctrine of spirits, then, as a consequence, when he declared, "*ye cannot serve God and Mammon;*" he in an equal degree sanctioned the existence of the God Mammon, and consequently was a believer in the heathen mythology. We would, besides, put it to the advocates of an immortal soul—apart from this, which we cannot but esteem both a correct and a sound view of the case—how far their cause is aided, or by what authority they can avail themselves of that class of popular superstition which confers a bodily form upon spiritual appearances? for, according to *their own* description of the soul, it is immaterial and aërial, neither tangible to the touch, nor visible to the sight; and, consequently, without some such explanation of the remark of Jesus upon which we have been commenting, their cause will not be aided, nor can they be allowed to avail themselves of the prejudices of those who thought—"they "*saw* a spirit."

Having now completed that portion of our scriptural inquiry, which is stated at page 19; our succeeding investigation will be directed to the controversy relative to the state of the dead previously to the day of judgment, and to a defence of THE SCRIPTURAL DOCTRINE OF A RESURRECTION FROM THE DEAD; under which latter division of our argument, being that which will terminate this series of Essays, we design replying to the general deistical arguments upon this most important subject.

ON A DEATH-BED REPENTANCE.

THAT the religious opinions of mankind were inconsistent, or irrational, would be of little import, if those opinions had not an effect, immediate and important, upon their conduct, their happiness, and their character. Principles openly pernicious and immoral, have, indeed, seldom, if ever, been directly inculcated; yet, many doctrines, in their effects demoralizing, have been, and continue to be, commonly received amongst the professors of religion; like those under

currents, discovered by voyagers in the ocean, which take a course directly contrary to the tide, appearing on the surface, many principles, generally received and regarded as christian, and professedly tending towards the religious improvement of mankind, have, in secret, by their moral operation, been strongly opposed to that improvement, and have imperceptibly been counteracting their real happiness. The whole scheme of Calvinism, with its unscriptural doctrines of natural depravity, and of vicarious punishment, is liable to this objection; but on no subject, perhaps, have more pernicious consequences resulted, (not only amongst the followers of Calvin, but in the Church of Rome, in our own established church, and in many, perhaps in most others) than from the ideas which generally prevail in society respecting preparation for death, and the proper time for commencing a course of religious improvement.

No man, professing to teach religion, has ever yet perhaps in so many words inculcated delay in religious improvement; no preacher has actually *said* to his hearers, "be "vicious to day, you may reform to-morrow; indulge your-"selves in every degree of excess and impurity, you can "repent upon your death bed." Yet many men and many large religious sects *have* taught, and *do* teach, these things indirectly and in effect, by their creeds and principles. Their followers, after hearing that repentance is necessary, and that they must be converted before they can hope to be saved, are taught that conversion is a thing not within their own ability, which comes by the unlooked-for and overpowering influence of a supernatural being, and they hear numberless instances, strongly insisted on, of individuals, who, after a life of profligacy, immorality, and crime, have made a happy and a glorious end, by means of a death-bed repentance. Why then, should their hearers, with needless trouble, seek a conversion which will come uncalled for; or rather, why should they not be content to wait for a repentance, which, after a life of excess, indulgence, and debauchery, will seek them, like the peaceful slumbers of the grave, in the last hour?

"Father Confessor," (was, we are told, the language of Philip the II, of Spain, when at the point of death) "Father "Confessor, as you occupy the place of God, I protest to "you that I will do every thing you shall say to be necessary "for my being saved; so that what I omit doing shall be "placed to your account, as I am ready to acquit myself of "all that shall be ordered to me." A smile will, perhaps,

arise in the faces of many at such an address; but is this not appropriate, consistent, and—allowing the truth of what is taught by priests—even rational? If there *be* efficacy in forms and ceremonies, if there *be* virtue in the profession of creeds and dogmas, if there *be* power and influence in the hands of a priesthood, why should they not be exerted in the way, and at the hour, thus requested by the royal bigot? In the same spirit, (consistent in their absurdity and fanaticism) it was the practice of the opulent christians of the third or fourth century, to defer baptism till they were on the point of death, and that for a very evident and sufficient reason. Baptism, they were taught, washed away all previous sin; in placing the rite, therefore, at the last hour, they thought they had hit upon a happy expedient, by which they could reconcile a life of indulgence and vice here, with an eternity of happiness hereafter. A similar practice is continued and most religiously observed in our own days; not, indeed, with regard to the baptism of water, but by the latest possible application of the baptism of virtue and repentance. It has become, by common consent, almost the universal opinion of mankind, that religion, though proper to all on Sundays, and particularly during the hours of "divine service," as it is called, yet, that it is more especially the virtue of old age, and that it peculiarly belongs to the agonies and the terrors of the last—the parting scene of our existence. The good Catholic finds, in the absolution of the priest, and in the "extreme unction" there poured out upon him, a passport to the grave in peace, and an introduction to the blessings of futurity. The decent churchman, whose religion throughout life, has, even avowedly, been a mere matter of attention to what he considers the proper order and decorum of society, flies at that hour to religion, with a warmth which he never before experienced. Even the sceptic who, amid the pleasures and the luxuries of life, laughed at the precepts and the doctrines of Christianity, has been known, (we speak here of our own knowledge) when death threatened those who were most dear to him, to read over the prayers of the church, and to request the intercession of the priest upon the awful occasion. With the more fanatical and enthusiastic sects amongst the dissenters, this absurdity is more palpably evident. Hardened sinners, groaning under a sense of their own depravity, and horror-struck at the recollection of a life ill spent, have been soothed to peace, or raised to ecstacy by the hopes, the *certainty* rather, of a

blessed eternity, conveyed by a late repentance, and assured to them by the sufferings of "*the lamb that was slain,*" in whose blood, these wretches are described as washed till they have become as white as snow. Our public prints frequently present us with an extreme and a dreadful description of this fatal delusion, in the execution of criminals. These are industriously and constantly attended by priests, who instead of honestly telling the truth, however harsh it might sound, to men whom the truth only could benefit, seek, on such occasions, to make proselytes to their own peculiar doctrines and modes of faith, and present the world with the amazing and pernicious anomaly of murderers and malefactors; men—and women too, who have deliberately shed human blood, perhaps that of their dearest relatives, who have lived in ignorance, or in disregard of all the duties and all the decencies of life, yet confidently stating their expectation of eternal happiness, speaking of the heavens as open to receive their appointed inhabitants, and joyfully calling on Jesus as their master, whose they are, and by whom they have been purchased with his blood.*

---

* In the month of January last, the public papers described the last moments of Robert Hartley, who was executed, near Maidstone, for wilfully stabbing Captain Owen, of the Bellerophon, lying at Sheerness, where the prisoner had been confined as a convict.—"From the time of his condemnation to Wednesday evening last, the unhappy man behaved in the most hardened and impenitent manner, stating his disbelief of a future state, and disregarding the pious exhortations of the Rev. Mr. Winter, chaplain to the gaol: he was wont to speak of his many heinous offences with exultation; and, since his trial, has confessed to Mr. Winter upwards of 200 burglaries and robberies committed by him from the age of ten years to the present time, and which he said were not all: for the present we abstain from making public his confession. On Sunday last, one of the turnkeys asked him if he was not cold; he said 'No; but I shall be a d—d sight colder this night week, or else hotter, I don't know which yet, but I will come back and let you know.' On Monday he said, 'If I was to be set at liberty to-night, I should do something before morning to get in again.' On Wednesday his time was chiefly employed in making observations which prove the depravity of his heart; he requested one of the turnkeys to go for the surgeon of the gaol, saying, he wished to sell his body, for he was sure the resurrection men would stick a knife into him; and he might as well sell himself as for them to take him; that he knew a girl at Chatham that he should like to give the money to. At another time, he said to one of the prisoners guarding him, 'I wish you were going out to-morrow, for then I would give you my carcass, it would fetch two guineas, and that would be of some service to you:' he also said, he should like to stop at some public house on the road and have half a pint of rum, before he got on the heath to-morrow." It was to an individual thus circumstanced and thus feeling, that the consolations of religion, and the *supposed* efficacy of the sacrament

The constant allusions made on these occasions to a difficult and probably misunderstood, even if not interpolated, passage of scripture, may render a brief reference to that passage desirable. It is the expression of Jesus to one of the malefactors who was crucified with him, "*This day shalt thou be with me in Paradise.*" It may, in various ways be shewn, that this passage in no way warrants the application made of it, even should its genuineness be admitted. In the first place, we know nothing of the *life* of this individual; we are not told, that there was any thing in his conduct peculiarly wicked and depraved. Critics of considerable learning have, indeed, inferred from the nature of the punishment, that the crimes for which these robbers or malefactors, as they are called, were condemned, were of a political, not a moral description; it is certain, that punishment did not in this case, necessarily imply guilt, for, Jesus —the virtuous Jesus—was "*crucified in the midst.*" If little is said from which we can infer the depravity of this individual, still less, indeed nothing at all—*not one single word*—is said by the writer of his repentance or conversion. He is described by Luke, as from the first, rebuking the railling of the other malefactor; he does no more than this; except it be by saying to Jesus, "*Lord, remember me when*

---

were held out. "In the evening, Mr. Winter was with him from six till half-past eight o'clock, when he, for the first time, *joined in prayer*, and *consented to receive the sacrament in the morning*. The worthy Chaplain visited him again at eight o'clock on Thursday morning, when he said he had slept very well till about three o'clock, from which time he was much harassed with shocking dreams. *He received the sacrament*, and appeared much affected: but, upon being asked by Mr. Winter whether, if he was discharged, he should lead an honest life, he replied, "No; he should go on the same way again." After "*winking his eye and laughing*" at two women whom he saw on his way to the place of execution, and smiling at the sight of the gallows, he is described as "*paying great attention*" to "*a very impressive and appropriate prayer read by the worthy chaplain,*" and when the cap was drawn over his face, he said with a loud voice, "*Lord Jesus, into thy hands I commit my spirit; pray let this be a warning to you all; I wish you all a happy new year!*" and then he was launched into eternity."—Briefly to notice another case, (though worse than either might be found): the following is the language of Joseph How, executed in the United States of America, September 1821, for robbing a mail; and who asserted that he had committed 20,000 depredations. "My offences have been great and many; for the last 14 years of my life, I have been a thief, and have robbed on a larger scale than any other robber I ever heard of. Since my trial, I have been confined in a dreary dungeon, without hopes of any mercy here, *and looking forward to a crown of everlasting glory in the world to come, through the intercession of my blessed Saviour.*"

"*thou comest into thy kingdom;*" but to any instantaneous or miraculous conversion of mind, there is no allusion whatever, either direct or indirect. Might he not have known the history and heard of the mission of Jesus, and desire to be admitted into his kingdom, whether he believed that kingdom to be temporal or otherwise, without any conversion at that time effected in his mind? At any rate, have we any right to affix a meaning to the words of the historian, which they do not carry with them, except by a much-strained inference, and supplying ideas not implied in the original narration.* The genuineness of the passage itself, is also a fair subject of dispute. The fact is recorded by Luke only, who was not present, and who, probably had not even seen Jesus, not having been a disciple in his life time. It is *not* mentioned by John, who witnessed the whole scene of the crucifixion. By Mark, it is not referred to. Nay, more, it is absolutely contradicted by one of the apostles, Matthew, who states, that "*the thieves*" (that is, *both* the thieves) "*joined with the priests, and those that passed by, in*

---

* An explanation has been given of this passage in reference to the meaning of the original word rendered *Paradise*, which, to say the least, is extremely ingenious. Of the phrase itself, the reader will find a full explanation in Parkhurst's Greek Lexicon, 8vo. edition, p. 498. The word *paradiesos* was considered by the Greeks as a barbaric phrase, being borrowed by them from the Persians. It has been supposed to be compounded of a Hebrew word *to separate*, and an Arabic one *to hide*, signifying a secret inclosure or a hidden place of separation. Thus, in one sense, it signified a garden, park, or inclosure, (like those of the Oriental monarchs) which are spoken of as "Paradises, full of every thing beautiful and good that the earth can "produce." In this sense, the word appears to have been used by the LXX. Hez. ii. 8, Eccles. ii. 5, and probably by the writer of the book of Revelations in c. ii. 7. The word occurs only in two other places throughout all the books of the New Testament, and in those two this "barbaric name" may signify—certainly not a garden, but rather *the hidden and separate state* after death. Thus, Paul, when he speaks (2 Cor. xii. 4) of one who was caught up into *paradise*, (the *hidden state*) in the same spirit adds, that he heard "UNSPEAKABLE *words, which it is* "*not lawful for a man to utter.*" In this sense, the word has by some been rendered in explanation of the present passage. The request of the individual was, that Jesus should "*remember him when he came into his kingdom;*" that is, into his *temporal* kingdom; it being absurd to expect, that an individual so circumstanced, should have more enlightened views on this subject than the very apostles themselves. The answer of Jesus, then, it is said, contains a feeling but dignified reproof, "*Verily I say unto thee, to day* "*shalt thou be with me in Paradise,*" (the hidden and separate state) as though he had said, "It is vain to employ your last moments on subjects of "temporal and earthly greatness, when you, like me, shall this day repose "in the silence and obscurity of the grave."

"*reviling Jesus;*" whereas, this passage in Luke speaks of one only as reviling, and states, that the other spoke coolly and argumentatively in his defence. The critical part of the argument on this subject, has been shortly but well summed up in a note of the "Improved Version," "This "verse (it is said) was wanting in the copies of Marcian "and other reputed heretics; and in some of the older copies "in the time of Origen: nor is it cited either by Justin; "Irenæus, or Tertullian; though the two former have "quoted almost every text in Luke which relates to the "crucifixion; and Tertullian wrote concerning the inter-"mediate state." The silence of such writers as these, desirous as they constantly were of supporting their pagan notions by a constant reference to the christian writers, may, we really think, in fair argument, be taken as conclusive against the genuineness of the passage.

Another passage often referred to in support of a late, or a death-bed repentance, is the parable of the labourers, who, although hired at the eleventh hour, received the same wages as those who had borne the heat and burthen of the day. Here, however, there is a palpable misunderstanding or perversion of the intention of Jesus. This parable, like many others in the New Testament, referred to the relative situation of the Jews and the gentile world. The object of Jesus was to convince the former that the latter had an equal claim with themselves to the blessings of the christian covenant. They, the gentiles, were the labourers who were employed only at the eleventh hour, whilst it was the Jewish people who are described as having been called in the morning, and, as thus, claiming pre-eminence from having borne the burthen and the heat of the day.

We have thus enlarged on a portion of the textual part of this subject, from a knowledge of the evil which is done in supporting false and mischievous doctrines by an ignorance or a perversion of the true sense of the scriptures. We are satisfied that a reference to the teaching of Jesus and of his apostles, will tend directly to establish the danger and the wickedness of deferring the task of improvement and virtue; and we are equally assured, that, as we advance in life, that task becomes more and more difficult; and that in any one moment, and above all, in the last—weak, terrific, agonizing moment of our existence, its achievement is morally impossible. The whole spirit of the gospel is this, that we are to *build up* ourselves and each other in our most holy

faith. We are to controul our passions; to cut off and pluck out our evil desires; to cultivate every good and proper affection; to run the race of virtue, "*not*" (was the reservation even of an apostle) "*not as though I had already* "*attained, either were already perfect; but this one thing I* "*do, forgetting those things which are behind and reaching* "*forth unto those things which are before, I press toward the* "*mark for the prize of the high calling which is in Jesus.*" Yet this arduous race, this gradual, this difficult progress, respecting his success in which, even with all his life and all his powers devoted to the object, the chief of the apostles himself speaks with hesitation and humility—this race, this progress—the defenders of the doctrine, which we are discussing, contend—can be successfully run in a moment; and that, even in the weakness and distraction of the dying hour, a man may speed from the farthest recesses of vice, and, without a single struggle with his fellow racers, gain completely and at once, "*the prize of the high calling which* "*is in Jesus.*" The answer to all this is brief. Calvinism it may be, but it is not Christianity. We have said, that a death-bed repentance, or a thorough alteration of the mind of man in the space of a moment is morally impossible. The expression is, we are aware, a strong one; but on this subject we scarcely see how we can limit it. Miraculous interposition we have no right to expect; not only has it now ceased altogether, but it never was, and probably never will be, used in producing any instantaneous or super-natural effect upon the human mind. That it was thus used by Jesus and his apostles, is, we are persuaded, altogether a mistaken and unfounded idea. The mind of man, his intellect and character, appear to be wholly formed by his natural and constitutional organization, as operated upon by the circumstances in which he has been placed—the habits which he has formed—the passions which he has indulged—and the thoughts and feelings which have passed through and occupied his mind. *These form the man.* What they have made him, *he is;* what they have *not* created, *he cannot be;* what they have *not* prepared within him, others cannot cause—himself cannot form; life cannot produce, death cannot create. Sudden affliction, or any other sufficient cause, may, indeed, arouse a vicious man to as sudden a sense of his own depravity; nay, more, it may produce a strong, an uncontroulable determination, that his steps *shall* turn towards the paths of peace and virtue:—but this is *only* determination; and

much, very much will remain yet to do. They only, who have achieved it, will know the difficulties and the impediments in the way of such a task. It was not in a moment that the prodigal awoke to a sense of his degraded state, and even when he had arisen, he had yet to go from where he was, "*in a far country,*" before he could reach his fathers house. If cut off, therefore, by sudden, or unlooked-for death, let us not say, that repentance and reformation are but the work of a moment. We may, indeed, when pleasures are no longer within our reach, when passion can no more be indulged, and when the world is fading from our view, we may then, indeed, feel—earnestly and bitterly feel the emptiness of our past pursuits, and wish—anxiously wish—that our days had been employed on more substantial objects: but this is not repentance; or, even if repentance, this is not virtue. The man remains the same. All he can, he has, perhaps, done; but he *cannot* perform the work of years within the compass of a moment. Death has no magical influence. It strikes down, but it cannot raise up. Excellent, indeed, was the counsel of the wise man, "*Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy "might, for there is no works, nor device, nor knowledge, nor "wisdom, in the grave where thou goest.*" This is the language of reason, and it stands confirmed by the principles of revelation. All rational views of a future state teach us, that we shall be raised the same beings as we sink into the grave; with the same passions, the same feelings, the same vices, or virtues. "*As the tree falleth so it will lie;*" and so again it will grow and become re-animate. How false then, how absurd, nay, how wicked are doctrines which flatter the sloth natural to the human mind, when freed from the controul of virtue and true religion; and which have, at least, an indirect effect in favour of vice, by inducing men to defer to a distant and uncertain hour, and that perhaps an hour when reason shall desert them, the difficult task of repentance of heart and perfection of character. It well becomes every lover, not merely of rational religion, but of the human race, to bear his testimony against the diffusion of such pernicious and dangerous errors; and, above all, it is incumbent on us to guard youth against their demoralizing effects. Virtue and perfection of character, are points of difficult attainment. Like health, they are to be gained by exercise and exertion alone; to attain them is the object for which we are brought into being. To *induce* a man, therefore, either by open arguments, or by indirect

principles, to defer the business of his life to the last moment of his existence, is more wicked, because the stake is a larger one, than to persuade him to hazard the means of his subsistence at the gaming table, instead of cultivating habits of regular and persevering industry. Virtue, again, we say, is a difficult task; but therein lies the excellence of those who attain to it. To the mind rightly disposed, and which is acted on by right motives, the task will not continue to be difficult. The labour itself will become sweet, and the reward the most delightful that can visit and exalt the human bosom. But it is to be attained only by constant and unremitting exertions. It is the food of the mind; and, such is the condition of mortality, it is to be earned by the sweat of the brow. Religion—rational religion—affords the best means of its attainment. Such is the constitution of the human mind, which always acts with a view to self-interest and under the operation of motives, that solid excellence of character is, perhaps, impossible of attainment without the hopes and the aids held out by revelation. Here it is that rational views of religion possess an infinite superiority over superstition and fanaticism. It is in this point of view that opinions—that "modes of faith,"— become matters of serious and pre-eminent importance: and that, whilst apparently employed on subjects of mere theory and speculation, we may, in fact, be discussing questions of the greatest practical importance to mankind. Those only, who have made the experiment will know how difficult, even with the best intentions, is the even and undeviating course of truth and principle. When every other palliative of vice fails us, we deceive ourselves by procrastinating the task of virtue.

"The thing we can't but purpose, we postpone."

Fanaticism, as we have seen, gives a direct encouragement to this postponement:—rational religion condemns and reprobates it. It warns us of the delusiveness of our own hearts, the weakness of our own resolves; it exhorts us to be instant in season and out of season in the work of excellence; it tells us, that now is the appointed day in which we must prepare for eternity, for that "*the night cometh in* "*which no man can work.*" Taking a correct view of the human character, we here learn, that excellence and perfection are plants of slow and gradual growth. That he who looks to an instantaneous yet perfect change of his mind and character, is depending on that which is improbable in the extreme, if not morally impossible in its

nature. Repentance, with the view we have been taking, becomes a rational and sensible thing; it is a turning from the path of vice or folly, with a strong and over-powering feeling of sorrow and regret that we should have weakly degraded our being and disobeyed our Maker, by giving ourselves up the slaves of crime or passion. Conversion is no longer the mysterious and supernatural work of a heated or perverted imagination, but an alteration of the heart, the life, and the principles. It is the prudent conduct of a wise man who turns from misery to happiness, from the paths of destruction to the ways of eternal life. Virtue and religion are no longer considered as peculiarly appropriated to old age; their profession is no longer postponed to the last hour, to the parting scene of our existence. *Why* should religion be postponed to old age and to the hour of death? Because religion is gloomy, the fanatic might reply; because it forbids the enjoyments of life; because, in short, it teaches man selfishness, cruelty, and hypocrisy. Such a religion it is, indeed, well to postpone to the latest hour, and it might be better to dispense with it altogether. But if religion consist, as the writings of the New Testament teach us it does, in the right formation of the mind and the improvement of the character; if it seek the true happiness of man, by controlling his passions and directing his affections; if it be "*the power of God,*" to emancipate us from the thraldom of vice, and the "*wisdom of God*" to provide for the happiness of his creatures here and hereafter; if this be religion, and if the growth and influence of it upon the human heart be regular and progressive, then, surely, youth, and not old age, is the appropriate hour for its adoption, and our whole life, not our death-bed, the fitting scene for it exercise. Reader! reflect then! Remember the often quoted and still neglected language of the poet—

> Be wise to day! 'tis madness to defer;
> Next day the fatal precedent will plead;
> Thus on, till wisdom is pushed out of life.
> Procrastination is the thief of time;
> Year after year it steals till all are fled,
> AND TO THE MERCIES OF A MOMENT LEAVES
> THE VAST CONCERN OF AN ETERNAL SCENE.

ON RELIGIOUS WORSHIP.—Essay v.

THE JEWISH TEMPLE.

"What is man?
Where must he find his Maker? with what rites
Adore him? Will he hear, accept, and bless?
Or does he sit regardless of his works?
—'Tis Revelation satisfies all doubts."—*Cowper's Task, Book II.*

Our last Essay (vol. i. p. 321) was directed to prove, that the practice of public social, or joint prayer *was not instituted by Moses, or afterwards, by divine direction, introduced into the* TABERNACLE *worship.* In pursuance of the plan of argument previously laid down, (see vol. i. p. 215) we have now to inquire, *Whether or not that practice was introduced into, or formed a part of, the* TEMPLE *worship?*

All, or nearly all, that we have said respecting the tabernacle, equally applies to the temple worship. The tabernacle was a tent—the temple a palace; the one a temporary—the other a stable abode; each being successively chosen as the place of deposit for the ark, in which the children of Israel regarded Jehovah, their God and King, as being miraculously present. Each, therefore, was the seat or centre of both political government and religious worship. Within each Jehovah was, consequently, consulted by the priest, the judge, or the ruler; before each, sacrifices or offerings were made, and, in or towards each, the prayers or petitions of the people were allowed to be presented to their God and King. It is in the last of these respects, that the Jewish temple becomes connected with our present inquiry. Was the authorised prayer of that temple joint or separate?—was it individual or social? These are the questions which remain for solution in the course of the present Essay. Amongst the advocates of social prayer there exists the greatest possible difference of opinion on this point; some positively asserting that the prayer of the Jewish temple was joint or social, whilst others as positively deny the fact. This very difference of opinion tends, to say the least, to throw considerable doubt on the affirmative of

this question; for, if social prayer *was* then commanded and then practised, it would, doubtless, be so clearly enjoined, and so frequently related and referred to, that there would not exist room for a rational doubt on the subject. Who entertains doubts as to the sacrifices of the Jews—as to their practice of the rite of circumcision, or any other of their principal forms and ceremonies? Who could read the records of the English nation—their history, political and ecclesiastical—their church annals and their devotional exercises—their prayers, their psalms, and their hymns, and for a moment doubt, whether or not that people practised joint or social prayer? Yet it *is* regarded as a matter of doubt and made a matter of controversy, whether or not the Jewish people (of whom we have all these remains) did or did not practice it. We subjoin, in parallel columns, for the convenience of comparison, some assertions which have been made on this subject, calling the attention of our readers to the following circumstances: first, that all these are the testimonies of *defenders of, or believers in, the practice of social prayer;* secondly, that, regarding the question as a matter of learning and authority only, decidedly the best and the strongest authorities are on our side of the question on this point; and, thirdly, above all, that we pledge ourselves in our after remarks, to show from the testimony of scripture, as well as from the nature and circumstances of the case, that social or joint prayer was not, and could not have been practised in the Jewish temple. We proceed to give the contradictory positions on this subject.

PRIDEAUX.	MOORE.
"Neither *had they any public forms to pray by,* nor any public ministers to officiate to them herein."—Part I. b. 6.	"It appears, however, on the best authority, *that they had forms* and of these several have been given."—Page 56.
PRIDEAUX.	LEWIS.
"But all prayed *in private to themselves,* and all *according to their own private conceptions.*"—Ibid.	"They had *liturgies or prescribed forms,* which may be proved to have been in use from the very infancy of the Hebrew nation."—Vol. ii. 431.
PRIESTLEY.	MOORE.
"In the usual mode of worship among the Jews, the people prayed in the great court of the temple, at the time that the priests were offering incense in the holy place, *each person praying for himself.*"	"It is evident, that the entire service of the temple was not only public *but as social as possible.* It was the service of the whole people *conducted by officers* appointed for the purpose."—Page 56.

MAIMONIDES,
AS QUOTED BY MOORE.

"Their prayers were, *at first*, free and unrestrained with respect both to time and forms; but *after* their return from the Babylonish captivity they made use of forms and at stated times."

MOORE.

"The Hebrews *from the infancy of their nation*, were accustomed to it," (146) "we shall be able to prove, even social prayer a practice with which the *ancient* Jews were familiar."—29.

PRIDEAUX.

"They having had no synagogues till *after* the Babylonish captivity, *till then* they had not any set forms of their prayers."—182.

BENNETT.

"'Tis plain, that the ancient Jews *did* use some pre-composed form of prayer *before* their return from the Babylonish captivity."—18.*

Neither let it be supposed from these conflicting and contradictory assertions, that the subject is one of doubt and uncertainty; or one, the authorities for which are equally divided on either side. The concessions above made, that social prayer was *not* used in the temple, have been wrung by the force of facts, and of evidence, from writers who, as before stated, were warm defenders of the practice, and who would willingly have found it there, if such had been in their power; whilst those, who contend for the affirmative of this question, namely, that the ancient Jews *had* set forms of social prayer in the temple, appear to have been driven into this really untenable position by this circumstance—finding no authority for social prayer in the New Testament, and perceiving that it was not instituted or commanded by Jesus or his apostles, these writers have found themselves *compelled*, even, as we think we shall shew, without fact and against evidence, to trace it to the Mosaic dispensation; thus giving the practice, at least at one time, the support of a divine authority and the sanction of the supposed *example* of the Mesiah and his disciples, who are described as visiting the temple and frequenting the synagogues. That there is no *scriptural* authority for such a position, it will be the object of the remaining portion of this Essay to prove; bearing in mind what has been already argued, that, even had the Jews practised this form, as a part of their tabernacle or temple ceremonial, it would not, *therefore*, any more than sacrifice, circumcision, &c. be fitted for believers in the present age;

* The books quoted above are, Prideaux's Connection; Priestley's Letters to a Young Man, occasioned by Wakefield's Essay on Public Worship; Moore's Inquiry into the Scriptural Authority for Social Worship; Origines Hebrææ by Lewis; and Bennett's Brief History of the Joint use of pre-composed set Forms of Prayer, 1708.

but, that if this form did *not* form part of the Jewish system, that then it can only have become binding in the church of God by the express command of Jesus, the head of that church, or his appointed messengers; a command which it will be the object of a future Essay to prove that *they never gave*.

We proceed, then, to the question—*Was public social prayer by divine direction introduced into the temple worship?* That it was not so, and that it did not form a part of that worship, we purpose to demonstrate in the following manner:—First, By an inquiry into the origin and real object of the temple worship, shewing the ideas entertained by the Jews with regard to that building. Secondly, By a survey of the sacrifices and offerings made by the priests, and the thanksgivings of the levites, which latter did not consist of prayer at all, and in which they were *not* joined socially by the people, but where they avowedly acted as ministers and courtiers in the presence of, and before the throne of, their monarch. Thirdly, By an investigation into the various cases of prayer recorded or alluded to as taking place in the Jewish temple, shewing that these are either instances of consulting with the Deity on the part, individually, of the priest or the ruler, and in the expectation of a miraculous reply; or that when they are the prayers of the people, or of more than one person at the same time and place, that they are then cases of *individual* prayer, each person (although in a public and appointed place) "*praying*," to use the language of Prideaux on this subject, "*in private to* "*himself, and all according to their private conceptions*." Fourthly, By a reference to the various descriptions of the temple yet extant, by which it will appear, that there was *no place* set apart for social prayer, or in which it could have been performed. Fifthly, By an inquiry into the duties and employments of the priests, levites, and other officers of the temple, from which it will be evident, that there were no persons attached to that building who could have officiated in, or what is called led, the social prayers of the people. In connexion with one or other of these points, some incidental matter may arise, and, in addition to them, some minor points of supposed difficulty will remain to be commented upon; but we feel assured, that a survey of the whole, will convince every impartial reader, as it has already, with no other object in our view than a love of truth, convinced ourselves, that the comparatively modern, and, as we contend, anti-christian practice of social or joint prayer

has no precedent in, and can derive no sanction from, the worship of the Jewish temple.

Our first point of inquiry, then, is, as to the origin and real object of the temple, with a view to shew the ideas entertained by the Jews themselves with regard to that building. The children of Israel (regarding themselves as a "kingdom of "servants" to Jehovah; "*a holy or separate nation*" for his service; "*a peculiar treasure above all people*" in his sight) considered, as we have seen, Jehovah in the three-fold relation of their Creator, in common with the rest of mankind; their God, as the head of their visible church; and their proper king, as the sovereign of their body politic.* That the temple should become the "*habitation*" of Jehovah was early predicted: "*But unto the place which the Lord "our God shall choose out of all your tribes to put his name "there, even unto his habitation shall ye seek and thither shalt "thou come.*" (Deut. xii. 5; see also 2 Chron. vi. 4.) The following verse (Deut. xii. 6) describes also the nature of the worship which it was intended should be paid in this future habitation of Jehovah; but not one word is said of social prayer, as forming a part of such worship. "*And "thither ye shall bring your burnt offerings, and your sacrifices, "and your tithes, and heave offerings of your hand, and your "vows, and your free-will offerings, and the firstlings of your "herds and of your flocks and there ye shall eat before the "Lord your God.*" (See also verses 11 to 14, 26 and 32.) Solomon, in the same spirit, when describing his intended building to Hiram, the king of Tyre, says "*Behold I build "a house to the name of the Lord my God, to dedicate it to "him, and to burn before him sweet incense, and for the con-"tinual shew bread, and for the burnt offerings, morning and "evening, on the sabbaths and on the new moons, and on the "solemn feasts of the Lord our God. This is an ordinance "for ever in Israel.*" No such ordinance is referred to, or even hinted at, with regard to social prayer; hence it is evident, that the worship of the future temple was to be sacrifice, not, as in our modern churches and chapels, social prayer.

The court of the God and king of the Jewish nation had

---

* See Jennings B. i. ch. 1. This has been briefly and well expressed by Mr. Aspland, in his Sermons on Blasphemy: "The supreme governor of Israel was God himself. Religion and civil policy were the same. Idolatry was rebellion; and blasphemy, high treason."

hitherto been held in a tent; for such, in fact, was the tabernacle. (See 2 Sam. vii. 6). There was then "*no house* "*built unto the name of the Lord.*" (1 Kings, iii. 2.) David, intent on supplying this deficiency, exclaims to the prophet Nathan, "*See, now, I dwell in a house of cedar, but the ark* "*of God dwelleth in curtains.*" The building of "*the house* "*of God*" is, however, reserved for his son and successor, Solomon, who "*prepares a place for the ark of the covenant.*" That ark is, at length, brought into the place prepared for it, with great pomp and ceremony, and with sacrifices of sheep and oxen, but *not* with social prayer. (See 1 Kings, viii. 6, and 2 Chron. v. 2). All, therefore, that we have said as to the special presence of Jehovah in the tabernacle, applies equally to the temple, each being only remarkable in the eyes of the Jewish people as, successively, being the receptacle or place of deposit of the ark of the covenant. Thus the temple is spoken of as *the* HOUSE—its courts as *the* COURTS OF THE LORD. (See Ps. lxv. 4; lxxxiv. 1, 2, 3, 10; cxxii. 1; Ezra v. 8; Dan. i. 2; Eccl. v. 1; Jer. vii. 10). It is described as "*a house of rest for the ark of the covenant of* "*the Lord, and for the footstool of God*" (1 Chron. xxviii. 2); as "*the gates of the tent of the Lord*" (2 Chron. xxxi. 2); as a place which God had "*hallowed,*" and where he had "*put* "*his name*" (1 Kings, ix. 3; and 2 Chron. vi. 20); as "*a* "*house which God had chosen and sanctified*" (2 Chron. vii. 12); as "*his* HABITATION" (1 Sam. ii. 27); his "DWELLING "PLACE" (Ps. lxxvi. 2); lastly, as "A PALACE, NOT FOR "MAN, BUT FOR THE LORD GOD" (1 Chron. xxix. 1).

The temple, in one passage in the Old Testament, and in only one, is also called a "*house of prayer;*" (Isaiah lvi. 7) for here, as we shall hereafter see, in compliance with the request of Solomon, its builder, the *individual* prayers of the people were permitted to be made. The prayer was, however, made in this place not for the purpose of publicity or of sociality, but because, as we have seen, this was the house or palace of God. Those who have written the strongest in the favour of the modern practice of joint or social prayer, have been driven into this distinction, without perceiving its full force as against their own hypothesis; for, it is evident, that a Jewish practice (such as that of praying in or towards their temple) which was founded upon their own peculiar situation and views, must or should have ceased with the destruction of their temple, and their own dispersion as a people. Bishop Beveridge (Necessity and Advantage of Public Prayer, p. 12) calls the temple "*God's*

"*own house, where he himself was pleased in a more especial* "*manner to reside, and to distribute his blessings amongst those* "*who there prayed unto him for them; hence, whatsoever was* "*done in this house, is said to be done before God as there* "*specially present.*" (Eccles. v. 1; Jer. vii. 10.) Letitia Barbauld, also, in her reply to Gilbert Wakefield, (p. 24) admits, that the Jews "*naturally enough were apt to consider* "*their temple as the habitation of the Divine Being, in the* "*same manner as a palace is the habitation of an earthly* "*sovereign, a place where men come to make their court and* "*bring presents, and ask favours in return.*" Thus, Mr. Moore says, that "*to pray before the Lord was to pray in* "*his house, where he was supposed to dwell, originally in the* "*temple*" (Inquiry p. 40). This, then, was the sense in which the temple was called by the prophet Isaiah God's "*house of prayer.*" It was with similar views, as to the peculiar presence of Deity, that the children of Israel were directed to visit Jerusalem: "*Three times a year shall* "*all thy males appear before the Lord thy God, in the place* "*where he shall choose*" (Deut. xvi. 16; see also Exod. xxiii. 14—17; xxxiv. 23); and when there, the worship enjoined them was—not prayer, but offerings and sacrifice. The same object is also clearly adverted to in connexion with the future temple, where the prophet Zechariah (viii. 20) foretells, that "*it shall yet come to pass, that there shall come* "*people and the inhabitants of many cities; and the inhabitants* "*of one city shall go to another, saying, let us go speedily to* "*pray before*" (or to entreat the face of) "*the Lord, and to seek* "*the Lord of hosts.*" Why, it may be asked, should the inhabitants of one city invite those of another to visit the temple? Not, surely, for the purpose of *social* or *joint* prayer; *that* all could have as well performed in their own city, but because the temple was aknowledged as the peculiar residence of Jehovah. The same idea is maintained in the 23d verse, when it is said, that "*many people and* "*strong nations shall come to seek the Lord* IN JERUSALEM, *and* "*to pray before the Lord.*" (See also Zech. xiv. 16.)

Such were the views entertained by the Jewish people as to the origin and real object of their temple;—views, which it is desirable the reader should bear in mind throughout our inquiry into the temple worship, as they tend directly and strongly to shew *why* that worship was *public*, without creating the least necessity for believing, that the Jews met there for the purpose of joining in *social* prayer; the fact being, that that nation did not join in social prayer at all.

In perfect conformity with the views above stated, as to the nature and objects of the temple, will (to proceed to our second head of inquiry) be found the duties and employments of the priests, levites, and attendant officers.

"Since, then," (observes Jennings, B. i. c. 1) "Jehovah himself was the king, as well as the God, of Israel; it follows, that the priests and levites, who were the more immediate and stated attendants on his presence, in the royal tent or palace, as the tabernacle or temple may be styled; and to whom the execution of the law was, in many cases, committed; were properly ministers of state and of civil government, as well as of religion. Thus, to them it belonged to declare who were clean, and who were unclean; who should be shut out of the congregation, and who should be admitted into it. The people were to inquire of the law from their mouth, and that in respect to civil as well as to religious matters; and they were appointed to teach Jacob God's judgments and Israel his laws; '*even all* '*the statutes, which the Lord hath spoken unto them, by the hand of Moses*;' (Lev. x. 11) that is, the forensic laws, as well as the moral and ceremonial precepts."

This distinction between the priests of the Jewish nation and the self-named priests of modern times, is one, which (even independent of our present question) it may be of importance that we should bear in mind. The writer above quoted, goes on, with great propriety, to shew the justice of the practice, that the priests of the Jewish temple should have derived profit and support from the offerings, sacrifices, tithes, &c. These payments being "*designed, like* "*the civil list money of other nations, for the immediate sup-* "*port of the crown and the officers of state.*"* A completely mistaken idea, indeed, exists, as to the nature of the priestly office under the Mosaic dispensation, which, it becomes essential to our present subject that we should expose and remove. The theological world has been in the habit of considering a priest *then*, as *now*, as being purely a *religious* officer. The very meaning in the Hebrew of the word, rendered *priest*, (namely, *cohen*, or in the plural. *cohanim*) shews the fallacy of this idea. We must further quote on this subject the laborious author of the Jewish Antiquities.

* It will hence be evident to the reader, that an argument arises, in addition to the many often insisted on against the payment, in modern times, of tithes, and the other grievous expences of an established priesthood. We have another king—we have a political ministry to support, and we have a civil list money to pay; by all the arguments, therefore, of orthodoxy itself, we should not be called upon *also* to bear tithes and to support *another* ministry—that of the priesthood. We submit this question, with all due deference, to the consideration of the bench of Bishops, and of the two Universities.

"Our first inquiry is, what sort of officers the priests were, who are called in the Hebrew *cohanim?* The reason of this inquiry is, because we find in scripture the title *cohanim* applied to the officers of state, as well as to the ministers of the sanctuary. Thus, in the second book of Samuel, David's sons are said to have been *cohanim*. (2 Sam. viii. 18.) That they were not ministers of the sanctuary is certain, because they were of the tribe of Judah, not of Levi, to which tribe the ecclesiastical ministry was by the law expressly limited. Their being called *cohanim*, therefore, can mean no other than as our translators render the word, chief rulers, or principal officers of state. And so indeed this title seems to be explained in the parallel place in Chronicles, where the sons of David are said to have been *harishonim lejadh hammelek, primi ad manum regis*, 'chief about the king,' 1 Chron. xviii. 17. Thus also Ira, the Jairite, is called *cohèn le-David*, which our translators render, 'chief ruler about David,' 2 Sam. xx. 26. But more commonly the title, *cohanim*, is given to the minister of the sanctuary, who offered sacrifices, and otherwise officiated in the public worship. Hence arises that uncertainty, whether Potipherah and Jethro, the former the father-in-law of Joseph, the latter of Moses, were ecclesiastical or civil persons; which our translators have expressed by calling them priests in the text, and prince in the margin, Gen. xli. 45. Exod. ii. 16. The true reason of the different application of the word, *cohanim*, seems to be, that in the primary sense it imports those that minister to a king. They who were *lejadh hammelek*, about the king, or his ministers, were called his *cohanim*. And therefore, as God is a king, he had his *cohanim* as well as earthly monarchs, or such as attended on his special presence in the sanctuary, and ministered in the sacred service. Accordingly, having taken upon himself the character of the king of Israel, he commanded Moses to consecrate Aaron and his sons, *lecohèn li*, Exod. xxx. 30, to be his *cohanim*. Accordingly God's *cohanim* are said to come near unto the Lord, Exod. xix. 22, Numb. xvi. 5, as the ministers of state come near to a king, and attend in his presence." (Book i. ch. 5.)

Such was the Jewish priesthood;—the ministry, as it were; the cabinet—the officers of state of the Israelitish people: they were chosen, in the language of scripture, "*to minister unto the Lord in the priests' office.*" (Ex. xxvii. 21; xxviii. 29.) "*For every high-priest*" (argues the writer to the Hebrews) *is "ordained to offer gifts and sacrifices;"* evidently like the courtiers of an earthly Oriental monarch, "*and every priest standeth daily ministering and offering often-times the same sacrifices.*" (Chap. viii. 3; x. 11.)

The same general remarks applied above to the office of the priests, as ministers of state, equally apply to the Levites, Nathenims, &c. who may be regarded, some of them, as courtiers, or subordinate attendants on the royal presence, and others, in the more literal sense of the word, as *servants*, performing menial and laborious offices. The whole of these were inferior to the priests and their assistants in the service of the temple. The first class (see Jennings, B. i. c. 5) were "*to wait upon the sons of Aaron "for the service of the house of the Lord:*" that is, to assist

the priests in the exercise of their ministry; they were "to "purify the holy things; to prepare the shewbread, and flour "and wine for the sacrifice." The second class of the levites, formed the temple choir; music—vocal and instrumental—forming a portion of the regal ceremonies observed in the royal presence of the king of Israel. The third class were the porters, to whose charge the several gates of the court of the sanctuary were appointed by lot: "their proper business being to open and shut the gates, "and to attend at them by day as a sort of peace officers, "in order to prevent any tumult among the people; to "keep strangers, and the excommunicated, and unclean "persons from entering into the holy court; and, in short, "to prevent whatever might be prejudicial to the safety, "peace, and purity of the holy place and service." (See 1 Chron. ix. 13, &c.)

Such were the statesmen, the courtiers, the musicians, the attendants, and the servants of the court of the Jewish monarch. What has been said of the place and its attendants, by analogy, applies equally to the worship and the services which they respectively performed there. The worship of the Jewish temple was political as well as religious. It bore reference to, nay, it was wholly built upon the supposed peculiar presence of Jehovah in the ark, (which was deposited in the temple) and his visible and constant interposition as their God and King. Our immediate question is, *whether or not, social or joint prayer formed a part of that worship.* The existing evidence goes, as we think, full to the point, that it did *not* so.

The worship of the Jewish temple consisted chiefly, if not wholly, of two things, namely:—

First, The offerings and sacrifices made by the priests or ministers of state.

Second, The hymns of praise and thanksgiving, sung by the levites or courtiers.

In addition to these, which constituted the formal worship of the temple, *prayer* was also there offered up, but it was individual, not social prayer, and consisted of two kinds:

Firstly, The prayers offered officially by the judges, priests, or rulers, for the time being, which may be called political or national prayers, and which, being made in the interior of the temple and immediately before the ark, were necessarily in the absence of the people, and offered up in expectation of a miraculous reply.

Secondly, The prayers of the people, which were offered

up (and as we are prepared to prove *individually* offered up) *without* the temple, that is, in its *external* courts, chiefly at the time of sacrifice, when the Deity was supposed to be peculiarly propitious to prayer.

In the first of these cases the priest or ruler prayed, as we have said, *apart* from the people; in the last the people prayed *without* the priest, who was at the time employed in sacrifice. In each case the prayer was *individual;* in each, Mount Zion was chosen as the *place* of prayer, not for the purpose of publicity, or sociality, but for the cause which we have been above explaining, namely, the belief in the peculiar presence of Deity. The prayer of the Jewish temple, therefore, we argue, cannot, with any propriety, be brought in support of public social prayer in the manner now in use, or indeed of public social prayer at all.

It will be seen that, in the above classification, we have not included prayer at all in the worship of the temple. Strictly speaking, indeed, the *worship*—the ordained *worship* of the Jewish temple did not include prayer of any kind, either social or individual. The temple was, as we have seen, a palace; the *worship* of that temple consisted of certain prescribed modes of shewing respect or reverence to the monarch. These were by offerings or sacrifices, and by praises and thanksgivings; the former offered, the latter sung by the appointed and attendant courtiers. That the people, in or near the palace, should *also* present their prayers or petitions is natural enough, and that such prayers or petitions should *also*, in point of time, accompany the worship is extremely probable; but the prayer or petition itself did not constitute the worship. We may illustrate this, by a reference to the practice of earthly monarchs. The courtiers, by set forms and appointed ceremonies, worship or shew reverence to a king or emperor. A subject who approached the throne of an eastern monarch at such a time, would also prostrate himself before him. *This*, the prostration, would constitute the worship, or the act of reverence. If, at the same time, he had a request to make, or petition to offer, he would make, or offer it. Such petition or request would *accompany* the act of worship, but it is evident that it would not *be* the act of worship; the making a request not being (except remotely and indirectly, as implying inferiority) necessarily, if at all, an act of worship, as shewing respect or reverence.

To follow out the above illustration, and apply it more directly to our subject—social or joint prayer. The grandees

and ministers of an eastern monarch when present at his court, might all *jointly* and *socially* worship, or shew reverence to their king, by bowing before his throne and offering gifts at his footstool—*like the offerings and sacrifices of the Jewish priests or ministers.* The attendant courtiers might, likewise, in chorus, that is, jointly and socially, extol the greatness and celebrate the triumphs of their prince in pre-composed songs of praise—*like the psalms and hymns of the levites.* But, if either such grandees, or such courtiers, or the people who were assembled without, *in the courts of the palace,* should have requests to make or petitions to offer, *these* they would, of course, present *separately* and *individually,* and *not,* as in the other cases, jointly and socially; and that for the evident reason that as the wants and wishes of each differed from those of his fellows, either in kind or in degree, so the prayer and petition of each would be different from the prayer aud petition of those others. It is, in this place, unnecessary to adduce cases to illustrate this position. All that we are concerned to establish, is, that prayers or petitions, such as these last referred to, are like the prayers or petitions offered up by the people *in the outer courts which surrounded the Jewish temple;* that such, from their nature and circumstances, were necessarily individual, not joint or social; and that, although they accompanied the worship of that temple, they did not and could not form a part of that worship.

Neither, as we are prepared to shew, is this an idle or a mere verbal distinction. It is one founded in general truth, and particularly evidenced by the scripture account of the worship of the Jewish temple. We shall proceed, in support of this position, to shew that that worship consisted in the *sacrifices* of the priests and the *thanksgiving* of the levites; that the prayers offered up in or towards the Jewish temple were, indeed, consequent upon and connected with that worship, *but not a part of it;* and that such prayers, however proper in themselves, or, in consequence of the compact entered into, appropriate to the place in or towards which they were offered up; yet, not being part of the ceremonial worship of the temple, they were from their very nature individual, and can afford no pretence whatever for the modern practice; all the assertions, as to the matter of fact, made to a contrary effect being clearly unsupported by evidence, and only made, as it would appear, to support a weak and otherwise untenable cause.

The remainder of the present Essay will be devoted to a

consideration of the *first* department of our classification of the temple worship; namely, the *sacrifices* offered by the priests. The nature of sacrifice has been much disputed; and various opinions, supported by different degrees of authority, have been entertained upon the subject. We are not concerned to enter upon this question further than as it may tend to throw light upon our present inquiry. Thus much is certain, that sacrifice, as a mode of worship, was only fitted to an early state of society, and an unformed stage of the human mind, and to these it would appear to have been admirably fitted. Many passages of scripture might, indeed, be adduced, chiefly from the prophetic writings, to shew the light estimation in which the God of heaven and earth held the offerings and sacrifices of his creatures; but these chiefly bear reference to the superior value and importance of the moral qualities of the mind, and the virtues of the heart and character. Some have even contended that sacrifices were not originally, and in the first ages of society of divine origin. Thus much, however, is certain, that they formed a part of the Mosaic dispensation; and that their authority, as a part of the temple worship, was the same as that by which the temple itself was erected.

The whole law of Moses was wisely and judiciously accommodated to the then state of knowledge—to the removal of the then existing prejudices and the general cultivation of truth and enlightenment, by the means best adapted to the people, to whom the law was directly given. The end and object of these institutions, have been well described by Fleury, in his "*Short History of the Israelites.*"

"Every thing that is prescribed by the law relating to the quality of victims and the manner of performing the sacrifices, tended rather to cure the Israelites of their superstitions, by confining them to a few ceremonies, than to introduce new ones. Idolators sacrificed in more places, used more ceremonies, and a greater variety of animals, for they had every where temples and altars; and each family had their domestic gods, and particular superstitions. Thus God prepared his people, in a distant manner, for the abolishing bloody sacrifices, telling them often at the same time by his prophets, that he had no need of them, that they were not essential to religion, and that the worship most agreeable to him was, thanksgiving and conversion of heart." (Part ii. ch. 16.)

Thus, we find, in the Old Testament, the most constantly recurring commands against the worship of graven images or strange Gods; against the cruelties and enormities which generally accompanied that worship, and against the offering of sacrifices to any other being than the great Creator

of heaven and earth. With this view, all cruelty and every shadow of inhumanity (as in the case of human sacrifices, the offering up of children by their parents, &c.) were strictly forbidden. The firstlings of the flock, therefore, the first fruits of the harvest, and these the best and purest in kind and quality, were selected as the innocent and the appropriate means of expressing gratitude to the God and king of the Jewish people.

Some, in this view, have contended that sacrifices were first offered under the idea of gifts; the effect of which, in appeasing the anger and conciliating the favour of men, being observed, it was supposed they would have the like effect with God; they being also thus offered as an acknowledgment, that the parties received all their good things from the hand of God, and of his right in the whole of that of which they offered him a part. Allowing that these may have been the origin and primary intention of sacrifice, there was evidently something more than is here implied in the sacrifices of the Jewish people. *These* were expressly appointed by Jehovah as signs or tokens of that *covenant*, into which he had entered with the Jewish people. "*Behold,*" (was the language held to Moses, see Exod. xxxiv. 10) "*I make a covenant—observe that which I command thee this* "*day.*" They are then (verse 13) forbidden to worship other Gods, and directed (verse 18) to keep the appointed feasts of Jehovah. Sacrifices, as forming a part of this covenant, are in the immediately ensuing verse, the 19th, ordained and directed—"*All that are born is mine, and every first-* "*ling among thy cattle, whether ox or sheep. The first of the* "*first fruits of thy land thou shalt bring unto the house of the* "*Lord thy God.*" And it is emphatically added, (verse 27) that "*the Lord said unto Moses, write thou these words; for* "*after the tenor of these words, I have made a covenant with* "*thee and with Israel.*" There was thus what has been correctly called a political use and object in many of these sacrifices; they were rites, like those used by men with each other, (see vol. i. p. 99.) which signified the entering of the Jews into a state of covenant with Jehovah;* they were

* "There was also a political use of many of these sacrifices, which we have formerly taken notice of. Dr. Sykes makes all sacrifices to be federal rites, which implied men's entering into friendship with God; or, if they had violated their friendship with him, then they denoted reconciliation, and a renewal of that friendship. He supposes the fire on the altar represented God, who was anciently wont to manifest himself in a shechinah or

thus, as it were, in the first instance, an act of naturalization on the part of the people, implying their acknowledgment of Jehovah as their king; and when, afterwards, the condition of the compact had been violated, sacrifice then became the medium of reconciliation, and of bringing the individual or the nation back, and causing them again to be "*at one*" with God.

For these reasons, therefore, sacrifice was worship; it was *an accepted and approved mode* of shewing outward respect and reverence to God. The whole worship of the temple was arbitrary in its nature, as it was conventional in its forms. Modes of shewing respect, have, in all ages, been conventional merely. Thus, the uncovering the head and bending the body, are modes adopted amongst ourselves. The uncovering of the feet, on the contrary, and the prostration of the body, are modes adopted in eastern countries. The presenting of gifts (usual amongst us from the rich to the poor) is, in those countries, the universal mode by which the poor and the weak pay their court and testify their respect to the rich and powerful. The national sacrifices, then, were *the gifts* of the Jewish nation. To illustrate the subject by a more *gothic* allusion, these formed the *tenure* by which they held their lands and possessions; they were the *suit and service* to be paid to their liege Lord. Sacrifices may be almost said to have been *hierogliphical:* "their design" (as has been well expressed by Mr. Moore, *Inquiry* p. 47) "being to express "the religious sentiments of the worshipper *by actions* "*instead of words;* they were *symbols* of the devout homage "of the mind in acknowledgement of divine beneficence, "or expressions of penitence intended to conciliate the "favour of an offended Deity." But still, to return to our point, sacrifice constituted worship *only because it was commanded;* had it *not* been commanded, sacrifice would *not* have been worship, because it would *not* have been obedience. Now prayer, however proper in itself, *was never*

---

flame; as he did to Moses in the bush, and in the holy of holies in the Jewish tabernacle. And accordingly those sacrifices, part of which was consumed on the altar, and part eat by the offerers, signified their being in friendship with God, and their desire of continuing so; eating and drinking together being an ancient rite, and token of friendship among men. And the whole burnt-offering, in which all was given to God, being consumed on his altar, signified their desire of reconciliation and renewed friendship with him; and their acknowledgment of their unworthiness of it, as they eat of no part of the sacrifice."—Jennings, book i. c 5, p. 161.

commanded—was never instituted as A PART OF THE TEMPLE WORSHIP. Though always associated with reverence or worship, it is not, as has already been argued, itself reverence or worship. The distinction, therefore, is as obvious as it is important. *Sacrifice* IN THE TEMPLE *was* COMMANDED, *it was* IMPERATIVE; *a duty to be paid by the nation.* PRAYER, IN THE TEMPLE, *was* PERMITTED; *it was* OPTIONAL, *a* PRIVILEGE *allowed to the* INDIVIDUAL. The duty *must* have been social, for it was imposed upon all, the time and place being fixed. The privilege must have been exercised individually, for, though all might be bound to obey a command, yet only those who chose, and that as rarely or as frequently as they chose, would accept a privilege granted them.

This distinction, essential to the question of social prayer, will be found amply supported by a reference to the scriptures. The command for sacrifice—for national sacrifice—if we may so use the words, for *public social* sacrifice, is plain and absolute. "*These*" (the Jewish lawgiver enjoins, Deut. xii. 1, 5, 6) "*these are the statutes and* "*judgments which ye shall observe to do in the land which the* "*Lord thy God giveth thee—unto the place which the Lord* "*your God shall choose out of all your tribes to put his name* "*there; even unto his habitation shall ye seek, and thither* "*thou shalt come, and thither ye shall bring your burnt offer-* "*ings, and your sacrifices, and your tithes, and heave offer-* "*ings of your hands, and your vows, and your free-will* "*offerings, and the firstlings of your herds and of your flocks.*" (See also verses 11, 14, 27; ch. xxvii. 7; and many other passages.) Here, it may be observed, the command for sacrifice is absolute and unconditional. The *intention* of the builder of the temple is equally evident: "*Behold*" (is the language of the king of Israel to the king of Tyre, 2 Chron. ii. 4) "*I build a house to the name of the Lord my* "*God, to dedicate to him, and to burn before him sweet incense,* "*and for the continual shew bread, and for the burnt offerings* "*morning and evening, on the sabbaths, and on the new moons,* "*and on the solemn feasts of the Lord our God. This is an* "*ordinance in Israel for ever.*" In pursuance of the same idea, we are told, that after the completion of the building, "*the Lord appeared unto Solomon by night, and said unto* "*him, I have heard thy prayer and have chosen this place for* "*a* HOUSE OF SACRIFICE;" (2 Chron. vii. 12). Thus identifying that building as being the identical place which, as seen above, was to be chosen as the habitation of Jehovah,

and in which sacrifice was commanded. The temple is, it is true, also called "*a house of prayer;*" it is so called in one passage, and *only in one passage,* in the Old Testament scriptures; but let us look at the circumstances under which it gained that title. It was expressly built, as we have just seen, as a house of *sacrifice;* but *after* its erection, its founder publicly made it a request to heaven, that God would especially hear the prayers which should be offered up, either in or towards that house. But here the distinction we have laid down becomes evident, Sacrifice had been *commanded* to the Jews as a nation; prayer, *individual* prayer, having been, at all times and places, permitted as a privilege to the people of God; it was, on the erection of the temple, especially requested by Solomon, that Deity would be gracious to hear and propitious to answer such as might be offered up, in or towards that place—his palace and supposed peculiar residence. Sacrifice, therefore, was regular, stated, joint, and social. Prayer was, to a certain extent, irregular and occasional—always separate and individual. The former was fixed and arranged according to positive commands, from which the people could not deviate; the latter depended for its purport and its frequency, on custom, together with the numberless circumstances which might arise, and the various dispositions of individuals. Sacrifice was to be offered up regularly at all times.—Prayer only when the occasion called for, or the feelings prompted it. Sacrifice was offered through the medium of the priest, in the immediate courts of the temple.—Prayer was personally offered up by the people themselves, without the mediation of a priest; and it was offered up *either in or towards* the temple, according as the individual might happen to be near to or distant from it. Sacrifice, therefore, *was* a part of the public national worship of the Jewish temple; but prayer was *not* so. These are distinctions, which, when we come more immediately to examine the recorded instances of prayer offered up in or towards the temple, we shall have occasion again to advert to; our immediate business is with the sacrifices of the priests, in order to shew that sacrifices were commanded, but that for the institution of public social prayer there is, positively, no evidence whatever. To prove these points we might adduce numberless passages of scripture; we shall, however, content ourselves with a few, and these the more striking—taking the first appointment of the Mosaic sacrifices; their introduction into the

temple worship; the practice in the time of Solomon; at the re-opening of the temple by Hezekiah; at the time of its abuse, by Ahaz; and lastly, at that of its rebuilding under the direction of Ezra and Nehemiah.

In the book of Exodus, xxix. 38, we find the appointment of the morning and evening sacrifices of the Jews. Where, we ask, is the appointment of morning and evening joint or social prayer? Those who contend, that the Jews had liturgies and practised social prayers "*from the infancy of their nation,*" are, surely, in fairness, bound to produce these. In the same book, xxx. 10, directions are given for a yearly atonement to be made with the blood of the sin offering throughout their generations. This was an atonement, or means of reconciliation by sacrifice. Where, we ask, is the appointment of an atonement by means of social or joint prayer? In the book of Numbers, chapters xxviii. and xxix. and in various other parts of the Old Testament the most express directions are given for the observance of the various feasts—the sabbaths, the passovers, &c. by means of public worship. That worship consisted, however, of offerings and of sacrifices, *not of social or joint prayer:* "*And the Lord spake unto* "*Moses, saying, command the children of Israel and say unto* "*them, my offering and my bread for my sacrifices made by* "*fire, for a sweet savour unto me, shall ye observe to offer* "*unto me in their due season;*" (Numb. xxviii. 1). To take one instance among the many which offer—the sabbath. Judging by modern practice, if there were any day on which social prayer would have formed a portion of the Jewish worship, it would, surely, have been the sabbath day. Let us hear the command of the Deity by the mouth of the Jewish lawgiver: "*And on the sabbath day two lambs* "*of the first year without spot, and two tenth deals of flour* "*for a meat offering, mingled with oil, and the drink offering* "*thereof; this is the burnt offering of every sabbath, beside* "*the continual burnt offering and the drink offering;*" (verse 9). Sacrifices and offerings, therefore, *not* social prayer, were the appointed public worship of the Jewish sabbath. The same remark applies, as the reader will perceive if he peruse the chapters above named, to the celebration of the new moons (xxviii. 11); of the passover (verse 16); of the day of first fruits (verse 26); of the feast of trumpets (xxix. 1); of the day called the day of the afflicting their souls (verse 7); and of the feast of tabernacles. "*These*

"*things*" (it is added, verse 39) *ye shall do unto the Lord in your "set feasts, besides your vows and your free-will offerings, for "your burnt offerings and your meat offerings, and for your "drink offerings, and for your peace offerings.*" The conclusion is emphatic: "*And Moses told the children of Israel "according to* ALL *that the Lord commanded Moses.*" Surely, those who contend, that they had also on these occasions, "*liturgies*" and "*prescribed forms of prayer conducted by "officers appointed for the purpose;*" surely, *they* contend for *more* than the scriptures tell us that "*the Lord commanded "Moses.*"

These and other sacrifices were appointed at the beginning of the Mosaic dispensation; neither will it be said that any alteration was made by Solomon on the erection of the temple. That the external, public and national worship of the Jewish temple, consisted in the sacrifices of the priests, and the praises, by means of songs set to music, of the levites, and *not, as in modern churches and chapels, in the social and set prayer of the people,* may be plainly collected from passages, such as the following:—"*Then Solomon offered burnt-"offerings unto the Lord, on the altar which he had built before "the porch; even after a certain rate every day, offering according to the commandment of Moses on the sabbaths, and "on the new moons, and on the solemn feasts, three times in "the year: and he appointed, according to the order of "David, his father, the courses of the priests to their service, "and the levites to their charges, to praise and minister before "the priests, as the duty of every day required; the porters "also by their courses at every gate; for so had David, the man "of God, commanded.*" It is added, that "*they departed "not from the commandment of the king, unto the priests and "levites, in any matter;*" and the description concludes with this remark, "*so the house of the Lord was perfected.*" (2 Chron. viii. 12 to 16; see also 1 Kings ix. 25.) We have here, therefore, the *perfect* worship of the Jewish temple, but no mention whatever is made of social prayer, as forming a part of that worship. The ark, with all its attendant ceremonies, had been brought into the holy place prepared for it. But social prayer had not, as we have already seen, been practised before the ark, and it was not now commanded or instituted by the architect of the palace of the Lord. The same distinction may be drawn throughout the historical allusions to the worship of the Jewish temple. When the covenant was renewed, in the time of Jehoiada the priest, he

is described (2 Chron. xxiii. 18) "*as appointing the officers* "*of the house of the Lord by the hands of the priests the levites,* "*whom David had distributed in the house of the Lord to offer* "*the burnt offerings of the Lord, as it is written in the law of* "*Moses; with rejoicing and with singing, as it was ordained* "*by David.*" In the succeeding reign of Joash it is added, (xxiv. 14) that there "*were made vessels for the house of* "*the Lord, even vessels to minister and offer withall, and they* "*offered burnt offerings*" (not social prayers) "*in the house of* "*the Lord continually.*" The abuse of the temple worship by Ahaz, and the perversion of its altar and implements to the purposes of idolatry, as described 2 Kings xvi. 10 and 2 Chron. xxviii. 24, strongly illustrate the same point. If carefully read over, it will be evident that the worship thus perverted, was worship by means of sacrifice, not of social prayer. These abominations of Ahaz we find forcibly described by his successor, the good king Hezekiah. "*Our fathers,*" (he says, 2 Chron. xxix. 6) "*have trespassed and done that* "*which was evil in the eyes of the Lord our God, and have* "*forsaken him, and have turned away their faces from the* "*habitation of the Lord, and turned their backs; also they* "*have shut up the doors of the porch, and put out the lamps,* "*and have not burnt incense, nor offered burnt offerings in the* "*holy place, unto the God of Israel; wherefore the wrath of* "*the Lord was upon Judah and Jerusalem.*" In this recapitulation of the sins of omission of the Jewish people, it will be seen that the omission of the forms of public social prayer is not included. The cleansing of the temple which ensues, is by means of sacrifice, not of social prayer. (See 2 Chron. xxix. 17.) The forms of worship which followed, in celebration of the restoration of the true religion, are exactly described; they consisted in the sacrifices on the part of the priests (verses 21, 27); singing and music on the part of the levites (verse 25); and bowing or prostration on the part of the king and people (verse 28 compared with 29); but no allusion whatever is made to any set form of joint or social prayer.

On the rebuilding of the temple, and the restoration of its worship, in the days of Ezra and Nehemiah, we are enabled to trace the same distinction. The reader may consult with this view what is called "the dedication" of this new building. (See Ezra vi. 16.) The children of Israel (under circumstances which, as connected with another department of the subject, we shall have occasion in a future Essay to notice) are described as making "*a sure covenant,*

"*and writing it; the princes, levites, and priests, being at the* "*sealing of it.*" (Neh. ix. 38.) "*And the rest of the people,*" it is added, (x. 28) "*the priests, the levites, the porters, the* "*singers, the Nethinims, and all they that had separated* "*themselves from the people of the land unto the law of God;* "*they clave to their brethren, their nobles, and entered into a* "*curse and into an oath, to walk in God's law which was given* "*by Moses the servant of God, and to observe and do all the* "*commandments of the Lord our God, and his judgments and* "*his statutes.*" The conditions of this solemn compact are fortunately recorded; from them we may collect what, upon its rebuilding and restoration, were the forms of worship of the Jewish temple, and whether or not social prayer was amongst the number. The people (not intermarrying with the strange nations, and observing the sabbath days) pledge themselves to provide for the shewbread (verse 33.) They engage to provide the wood offering "*at the times* "*appointed yearly, to burn upon the altar, as it was written* "*in the law*" (verse 34.) They swear that they will bring the first fruits of the ground, and the first born of their sons, and cattle, and herds, and flocks, and the first fruits of their dough, and offerings of wine, and of oil, and give the tythes of the ground unto the levites; all these they bind themselves to bring to the priests that minister, (or serve, by the offering up the sacrifices) and to the porters, and the singers; and they conclude, with solemnly declaring, that "*they will not forsake the house of their God:*" (verse 39.) A similar description of the worship of this second temple will be found, Ezra iii. 2. Here then, at *this* period also of the temple worship, we find provision made for the sacrifices; and support afforded to the priest who ministered in sacrifice, and to the singer or levite who offered thanksgiving, and to the porter who kept the gates; but there is *no provision made for social prayer; there is no support promised or provided for those who, according to the modern practice, were to lead the devotions of the congregation in social prayer.**

The above instances of worship, which we have noticed, are all of them, it may be observed, cases of national sacrifices; and, therefore, through the medium of the officiating priest, joined in and partaken by the whole Jewish

* Letitia Barbauld, even while contending for the practice of social prayer amongst the ancient Jews, is reluctantly compelled to admit with regard to the Temple, that "*its chief business was sacrifice not prayer.*"—Remarks, p. 29.

people, as a people. Besides these, however, there were other cases of what may be called *individual* sacrifice; that is, the offerings or sacrifices of individuals for personal considerations; and these were chiefly in cases where the compact, political and religious, existing between Jehovah and the Jewish people, had been broken by some sin, either of omission or commission, against the law, moral or ceremonial, which had been given by Moses. The appointed mode of worship (which, in such cases, has been well described, as signifying "a desire of reconciliation and renewed friendship with God," as a portion of his chosen family) was here also by offering and sacrifice, and *not* by prayer. The reader may consult on this subject, the seven first chapters of Leviticus, in which the several modes of expiation to be used by individuals for private and personal offences, are minutely described. The ceremonial worship here ordained, will be found *not* to consist of prayer; we may infer, indeed, that prayer, or that state of repentance and pious feeling which naturally leads to prayer, was *(to those who were sufficiently enlightened amongst them to comprehend it)* at all times essential to the purpose of *moral* purification. That the Jews too, or at least the well-informed amongst them, knew this—and in the more advanced stage of their existence as a people—may be collected from what is called the dedicatory prayer of Solomon; but chiefly from the sentiments contained in the later prophetical writings. But the outward—the public—the ceremonial mode of purification, expressly was by offerings and by sacrifice, *and not by joining in public and social prayer.*

Here then, we have traced, as it were, the history of sacrifice, in relation to the Jewish temple. We have not, indeed, gone minutely into individual cases, but we have seized the great and prominent features of the records remaining to us on the subject. We have seen the appointment of the national mode of worship under Moses;—morning and evening, and once in each year; on the sabbaths, and on the various feasts. We have followed this worship into the temple, where it was introduced by Solomon. We have noticed its perversion by an idolatrous king, and its renovation by a righteous monarch; and finally, we have seen described its restoration after its complete destruction during the captivity. In all these great and striking cases, sacrifice *is* appointed—*is* spoken of; and prayer—social prayer *is not* appointed—*is not* spoken of. What shall we infer? Surely, what we have already asserted,

THAT SACRIFICE, AND NOT SOCIAL PRAYER, WAS THE APPOINTED WORSHIP OF THE JEWISH TEMPLE. There may, indeed, be incidental cases which present apparent difficulties, and, therefore, require explanation; and that explanation in a future stage of the inquiry we purpose giving. But the above, let it be observed, are *not* incidental cases; they, all of them, bear reference to great and important events in which the worship of the temple is either pre-figured, or established, or restored. It is, surely, to times and to cases like these that we should look, if we would collect the real nature of the temple worship. That at *these* times and in *these* cases, we do *not* find the appointment of social prayer, is, surely, no weak argument in support of our position — *THAT SOCIAL OR JOINT PRAYER NEVER WAS INTENDED TO FORM, AND NEVER, IN FACT, DID FORM A PORTION OF THE WORSHIP OF THE JEWISH TEMPLE.*

Our next Essay will be directed, secondly, to the praises and thanksgivings of the levites, as the present one has been chiefly devoted to the offerings and sacrifices of the priests; when we shall proceed, thirdly, to inquire into the cases of prayer recorded as having been offered up in or towards that house; not doubting, but that we shall be able to support to the very letter, the position of Prideaux already quoted—that the Jews "*HAD NEITHER ANY PUBLIC FORMS TO PRAY BY, NOR ANY PUBLIC MINISTERS TO OFFICIATE TO THEM HEREIN; BUT THAT ALL PRAYED IN PRIVATE TO THEMSELVES, AND ALL ACCORDING TO THEIR PRIVATE CONCEPTIONS.*"

On Reading Hebrew Melodies, by LORD BYRON; *and Sacred Melodies, by* THOMAS MOORE.

Unholy hands, to sacred themes
  Awaken now the Psalmist's lyre;
Like *Aaron's* sons, who dared to fling
  Sweet incense in unhallow'd fire.

Like his own *Cain*, an out-cast—wild—
  See *Nadab* tread life's desert sand;
No gift he gives;—but hurls to earth
  The altar of his brother's hand.

Abihu, warm as seraph's love,
  Tracks his high course with angel wings;
Soars brightly, beauteously—then falls
  To earth, like those lost stars he sings.

THE FREETHINKING CHRISTIANS' REVIEW OF THE RELIGIOUS WORLD.

QUAKERISM.

"*Immediate Revelation* being a much easier way for men to establish their opinions and regulate their conduct, than the tedious and not always successful labour of strict reasoning; it is no wonder that some have been very apt to pretend to revelation, and to persuade themselves that they are under the peculiar guidance of heaven in their actions and opinions, especially in those of them which they cannot account for by the ordinary methods of knowledge and principles of reason. Hence, we see that in all ages, men, in whom *melancholy has mixed with devotion*, or whose *conceit of themselves* has raised them into an opinion of a greater familiarity with God, and a nearer admittance to his favour, than is afforded to others, have often flattered themselves with a persuasion of an *immediate intercourse with the Deity, and frequent communications from the divine spirit.*"

LOCKE'S *Essay concerning Human Understanding.*

OF the truth of the above reflections, as contained in Locke's masterly chapter on '*Enthusiasm,*' the history of Quakerism affords abundant evidence, a portion of which evidence we have in a former Essay endeavoured to open to the reader. That George Fox, the founder of Quakerism, was one of those in whom *melancholy was mixed with devotion*, may be collected from the unsocial and solitary life which, before he commenced his ministry, he appears to have led. That *conceit of himself* had, at a very early period, raised him into an opinion of greater familiarity with God, and a nearer admittance to his favour than is afforded to others, is evinced by the assurance contained in his journal, that at the age of *eleven, the Lord taught him to be faithful in all things*. Besides these early communications from the Lord, it appears also from the same authority, that Satan had made various overtures to the youthful prophet, which induced him to submit his condition to a certain "ancient priest" of Warwickshire. Quakerism had, perhaps, been unknown, if happily its founder had followed the prescription given, on this occasion, by the worthy priest, for "he "bid me" (says Fox, Journal, p. 4) "TAKE TOBACCO AND "SING PSALMS;" advice intended, no doubt, to dissipate the morbid and melancholy affections to which it was evident to the superior sagacity of the priest, the Quaker lad was a prey. His vanity, however, induced him to pronounce the priest ignorant of his condition; and hence, the disorder

became confirmed in Fox, and epidemic amongst his followers.

In our last, we presented our readers with a brief sketch of the early history of Quakerism, and of the first manifestations of this supposed "*immediate revelation*" or *inward light*, which it was our endeavour to show, from facts and arguments then adduced, was calculated to engender, and had, in fact, engendered pride, fanaticism, and folly. We pledged ourselves, however, to maintain a graver charge against this fatal and fallacious doctrine of Quakerism, by proving, that it is calculated "*to undermine the authority of the scriptures, and supercede the doctrines of the gospel.*" This pledge then proceed we now to redeem. THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION, or, as it is otherwise called, the GOSPEL, is a clear and simple system of revealed truth, given as a guide to the faith and practice of man: it is suited to his weakness; adapted to his wants; and necessary to his knowledge and happiness. This system consists not in the loose imaginations and uncertain suggestions of the human mind, but rather in express and defined doctrines and duties clearly communicated and easily to be collected from the scriptures of truth. Christianity proposes certain facts and principles to the judgment of men—as, the divine authority of Jesus as a messenger appointed by God, and as attested by the miracles he performed—the fact of his death and resurrection, as evidence of a future state of existence—the necessity of obedience to the divine will, as made known through Jesus—these constitute the sum and substance of the gospel. The record and the evidence of these truths are to be found in the scriptures, and the scriptures alone, as containing the history of the divine dealings with man, and as written chiefly by those who were witnesses of these things, and who were the appointed and inspired ministers of the divine will. Christianity existed, we readily grant, independent of, and anterior to, the books of the New Testament; the facts of christianity had transpired, and its principles had been promulgated before either were submitted to writing; and if Jesus and his apostles were again on earth, and we could receive from their lips the truths of christianity, then, indeed, would the scriptures of the New Testament become of minor importance; but being, as they now are, the *only* means by which we can arrive at a knowledge of the truths of christianity, so they are, from the very necessity of the case, the best and chief rule of faith and practice to the Christian. Clear and indisputable as these positions would appear to

be, the Quaker, by the very terms and substance of his creed, denies them all; and, by asserting that the scriptures are *not* essential to a knowledge of, or belief in christianity, he abandons the only authority to which we can appeal for a knowledge of revelation, for an hypothesis which is actually subversive of its truth. How effectually, indeed, the Quakers undervalue the scriptures may be collected from the works of their principal writers, and from the general history and proceedings of the sect; but the truth is, they *must* undervalue the scriptures—it is the direct and necessary tendency of their creed to produce such effect—their assertion of the importance they attach to the scriptures will stand them in little avail, as long as they hold the doctrine of *the inward light* and claim to be *illuminated directly by God himself*, upon the subject of religion. Conceding, indeed, to this sect the monstrous and presumptuous claim which they set up as to their possession of the *spirit of God*, they are but consistent in holding this to be a superior rule of faith to the scriptures; they are, however, inconsistent in affecting to attach any, the least, importance to the scriptures, and that for this evident reason, that these can teach them nothing but what they have a surer and better means of knowing. Of what importance can be the discourses and doctrines of Jesus, or the instructions and precepts of his apostles, delivered at a remote period of time, and subject, as must be confessed, in their transmission to us, to those obscurities and errors, from which no ancient written records can be free; if, in reality, the will of God be communicated to these people *immediately and miraculously by God himself?* The non-importance of the scriptures, upon the Quaker hypothesis, appears to us to be so clear—so really self evident, that we are doubtful whether any illustration can be offered to render it more so. Let us suppose, however, as a case, that—A is desirous of becoming acquainted with the mathematics; it may be supposed that for this purpose he will consult the Elements of Euclid. If B, however, is desirous of obtaining the same knowledge, and fancies he can do so by *intuition* or *inspiration*, will it be pretended that *he* would study the writings of Euclid, or attach any importance to them? Now the case of B is that of the Quaker; *he* professes to become acquainted with the science of religion by an infallible and unerring process—by the immediate operation of the divine mind upon his perceptions and faculties, and he naturally rejects a means of information, which, at

best, is comparatively imperfect—which, even if it approaches to the same result, can only do so by a tedious and uncertain path, and which cannot by possibility add any thing to the stock of knowledge of which he fancies himself to be already possessed. Or, to express our conclusion in the peculiarly apposite language of Barclay—"*The sum then of what is said amounts to this, that where the true inward knowledge of God is, through the revelation of his spirit,* THERE IS ALL; NEITHER IS THERE ANY ABSOLUTE NECESSITY OF ANY OTHER." (Apology, Prop. II.)

It cannot, of course, be expected that the Quakers should themselves have the candour to admit in the detail, and as fully as we have stated it, the slight which their creed puts upon the authority and value of the scriptures; and it is but candid to confess, that their writers are strong and loud in denying this imputation; but what then? if they are really sincere, it only shows, on the one hand, their inconsistency; and, on the other, their ignorance of that which they profess to believe. But even from the Quaker authorities and history, it will not be difficult to collect evidence—direct, clear, and conclusive evidence—in support of the objection we have thus raised against the Quaker creed.

So utterly useless—so much of an incumbrance—are the scriptures to the leading doctrines of Quakerism, that many of the sect have regarded them as a *dead letter;* and, neglecting their authority, have given themselves up, *consistently,* as we contend, to the leadings of the spirit; whilst their principal writers, as Barclay and Penn, have laboured in vain to reconcile the possession of the inward light with a sense of the importance of the scriptures. The whole tendency, however, of the system of Quakerism, as well as the positive statements of this system by its ablest defenders, is to disparage the scriptures. Thus, Barclay, in his Apology, Prop. III, "concerning the scriptures," states, "*nevertheless, because they are only a declaration of the fountain, and not the fountain itself; therefore they are not to be esteemed the* PRINCIPAL GROUND *of all truth and knowledge, nor yet the* ADEQUATE PRIMARY *rule of faith and manners. Yet, because they give a true and faithful testimony of the first foundation, they are and may be esteemed* A SECONDARY RULE, SUBORDINATE TO THE SPIRIT *from which they have all their excellency and certainty.*" Upon which candid statement and acknowledgment it will be sufficient to inquire—who will regard "the declaration of the fountain," when he possesses the fountain itself? Who will esteem the *secondary*

and *subordinate rule*, when he has the *principal* and *primary* one? Who will rest on a ground of knowledge admitted not to be *adequate*, when he can obtain that which is *adequate* and *complete?* The answer to these inquiries is furnished by Barclay himself, who, in reasoning on the above proposition, and in maintaining the superiority of the inward light (which he also calls—the *word of God*—the *eternal word*) over the writings and sayings of the scriptures, observes, "*when we doubt the* "*streams of any river or flood, we recur to the fountain itself,* "*and having found it, there we desist; we can go no further;* "*because there it springs out of the bowels of the earth, which* "*are inscrutable. Even so the writings and sayings of all* "*men,*" (and by these the scriptures are expressly intended) "*we must bring to the word of God, I mean the eternal word* "*and if* THEY AGREE THERETO, *we stand there; for this* "*word always proceedeth, and doth eternally proceed from* "*God, in and by which, the unsearchable wisdom of God,* "*and unsearchable counsel and will conceived in the heart of* "*God* IS REVEALED UNTO US;" (page 71, Ed. 1701). Here we submit, that the point we are contending for—the tendency of quakerism to undermine the authority of the scriptures—is fully and frankly admitted: for the argument of Barclay is, that we *may* doubt the streams—the scriptures; and that the writings and teachings of the servants of God as recorded in scriptures, are only to be adhered to "IF *they agree*" with the *inward light*—in other words, with the promptings of the disordered imaginations of George Fox and his followers!

This monstrous proposition of Barclay, is, we may observe, widely different from that which assumes, that *reason* is to judge of the scriptures and to determine on the degree of authority to be attached to their dictates, by means of a sound and enlightened comparison of one part with the whole, or of the whole with the character and general government of God. This last, however, (the use of reason) is, upon the same authority, expressly prohibited; for, speaking of the scriptures, Barclay says, (p. 68) "as "we freely acknowledge that their authority doth not de-"pend on the approbation of canons of any church or "assembly; *so neither can we subject them to the fallen, cor-*"*rupt, and defiled reason of man.*" Thus, then, the use of reason being proscribed in the examination of scripture, and the authority of scripture being *subordinate* to, and binding only as far as it agrees with, the dictates of a sup-

posed inward and hidden tribunal in the mind of man, which is subject to no rules—which is amenable to no authority; against whose decisions there is no appeal, and whose judgments cannot by possibility be distinguished from the operations of that reason, which is declared to be "fallen, corrupt, and defiled;"—thus, then, we say, is the value of the scriptures substantially and, in effect, set at nought, and their authority impeached, in a manner more insiduous, indeed, but not less effectual than that which Paine or Carlisle has adopted!

It is true, that the Quakers do not generally follow out to its natural and just extent, this principle of their creed; for whilst, on the one hand, they invalidate the authority of the scriptures, so, on the other, they assert and quote that authority when it appears to their purpose; and in cases of doctrine or discipline that may come before them, they are known to deal with such cases either according to the dictates of the spirit, *or* the directions of the scripture, as may best seem meet to them; whilst the confusion that has resulted from the exercise of two concurrent authorities, having no connection with each other, may readily be imagined. An instance of this kind occurred in the disputes and differences among the Society of Friends, with regard to the well-known case of Hannah Barnard. In a review of the controversy which arose out of this subject, the Monthly Review (vol. li. p. 97) remarks, "It appears "to us to be a difficulty to proceed with satisfaction in "disquisitions concerning doctrines, with *two paramount* "*courts of ultimate appeal*, as we may term them, viz. the "scriptures and the inward light." Now, though this remark, as far as it related to the unjust course of proceedings adopted by the Friends in the case of Hannah Barnard, is, at once, judicious and correct; yet, as we shall hereafter have occasion to shew, the Friends, in that instance, belied their profession, and departed from their own avowed principles, in order, to exclude one who had acted in strict conformity with those principles. For, according to Barclay and Penn—and, indeed, all the authorities among this sect—the scriptures and the inward light are not, *each* of them, *paramount* courts of ultimate appeal —the only court of ultimate appeal being the inward light! This point has, we think, been already established beyond doubt, from the writings of Barclay; but, with reference to the above dispute, a letter will be found in the Monthly Review, (vol. liii, p. 335) from the pen of a Quaker, signed

Philo; in which, after an ingenious, though unsuccessful, endeavour to reconcile the authority of the scripture with the present operation of the spirit, the writer is only enabled to say, on behalf of the scriptures, "the writings, "we believe, are, *as far as they go,* a rule of our conduct." What is this, but saying, that the authority of Jesus and his apostles, *as far as they go,* is a rule for my conduct—but, that *my own authority,* which is that of the spirit within me, *goes further,* and is, therefore, a better rule of conduct? And is it possible—we put this with earnestness to the Society of Friends—is it possible to shape a weapon more destructive to the authority of the scriptures, and to Christianity itself, than this? To shew, that not merely the scriptures, but, that the facts which constitute the very foundation of the gospel, have been placed in jeopardy by this deadly—this destructive instrument of the Quaker Theology, we will cite a striking passage from Barclay's "*Possibility and Necessity of Inward immediate Revelation;*" a work written originally in Latin, addressed to the Heer Adrian Paets,* ambassador from the United Netherlands to the court of Spain, and afterwards published, by Barclay, in English. "It is falsely supposed," (he observes) "that "the essence of the christian religion consists in the *historical* "*faith and knowledge of the birth, death, life, resurrection,* "*and ascension of Christ.* That faith and historical know-"ledge is, indeed, a part of the Christian religion; but "not such an essential part as that, without which, the "Christian religion cannot consist, but an integral part, "which goes to the completing of the Christian religion, "as the hands or feet of a man are integral parts of a man, "*without which, nevertheless, a man may exist;* but not an entire "and complete man." Admirable refinement! So, then, this historical faith and knowledge of the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus—and it has already been seen, that we can possess no other faith and knowledge of these things than is historically derived from the scriptures; yet, such a

* *Paets* had written a letter, in which he analized and refuted, with true scripture knowledge united with much logical skill, the Quaker doctrine of "inward immediate revelation." Barclay's reply, was made up of cautious syllogisms, or rather sophisms, unworthy of him as a scholar, and tending, in fact, to strengthen the objections it was designed to remove. It is difficult to believe such logic can have been dictated by the *spirit,* which, if used by a school-boy, would entitle him to the cap and bells. The Society of Friends must pardon us, if we are inclined to follow the advice of the scriptures, by "*trying the spirits, whether they be of the Lord.*"

faith is *not essential* to Christianity; it is only a part—an unimportant part of Christianity; bearing the same relation only to the system, as do the hands and feet to the man, without which, it is evident he can exist for all the higher and nobler purposes of life and action. How much in contrast with such sophistry as this, is the language of Paul: "*Moreover, brethren, I declare unto you the gospel* "*which I preached unto you, which also ye have received, and* "*wherein ye stand; by which, also, ye are saved, if ye keep* "*in memory what I preached unto you, unless ye have believed* "*in vain. For, I delivered unto you first of all, that which* "*I also received: how, that Christ died for our sins, according* "*to the scriptures; and that he was buried, and that he rose* "*again the third day, according the scriptures;*" 1 Cor. xv. 1—4). Here, it will be seen, that, at least in the estimation of an apostle, the death and resurrection of Christ, are not parts—unessential parts—of the gospel, but, that they are the gospel itself: they form *that* gospel or good news which Paul preached, which the first converts received, wherein they stood, and by which they were saved—"*unless, indeed, they had believed in vain.*" This faith or belief was, in the above case, also *historically received;* for Paul declares that he delivered, in the first instance, to the Corinthians, that which he had *also received—historically received,* there can be little doubt, from those who were, from the beginning, eye-witnesses and ministers of the word—and he proceeds, also, to give to the Corinthians, the *historical evidence* and the list of the witnesses, by which he had convinced them of the resurrection of Christ. The fact, then—the historical fact of the resurrection of Christ, we say, is the gospel, as preached or proclaimed by Paul. Barclay's *spirit*, however, testifieth differently; and, as he declares, (Apology p. 72) that "*the* SPIRIT, *and not the* "SCRIPTURES, *is the foundation and ground of all true* "*knowledge;*" so is he but consistent in rejecting Paul and following "that inward and immediate revelation," which he states to be "*the only sure and certain way to attain the* "*true and saving knowledge of God.*" Apology p. 25.

In a paper, published subsequently to "*The Possibility* "*and Necessity of Inward immediate Revelation,*" and designed to meet the same objections of *Adrian Paets,* to which the above was a direct reply, Barclay, as if conscious of the weakness of his former arguments, attempts to amend his case, by saying, "but we, with good reason, "distinguish between *historical* and *saving* knowledge, and

"between *historical* and *saving* faith." It is difficult for plain common sense people, like ourselves, to understand these distinctions. Admitting, however, for the purposes of our present argument, their validity—as long as the Quaker allows, that the *saving* knowledge and faith may be obtained without the *historical* knowledge and faith, the latter, of course, cannot be essential to the christian.

To maintain, however, the appearance of regard for the scriptures, the Quakers sometimes assert, that the *spirit*—the *inward testimony*—*cannot* contradict the *outward testimony of the scriptures*. But we must take leave to insist, that, even in the case above cited, with regard to the importance of the historical knowledge of the resurrection of Jesus, the spirit of Barclay, at least, *did* contradict the outward testimony of the scripture. We can prove also, that, in practice, the Friends have frequently, under the assumed influence of the spirit, acted in express derogation of scripture authority; and, if we are told, as is sometimes the case, that, because such apparent manifestations of the spirit are contrary to the scriptures, they are, therefore, not from God, or to be depended on; we shall readily admit such a conclusion on our own part; but we must, at the same time, reject such a plea as utterly irreconcilable with the system of our opponents—it is, in fact, an inversion of the order of the whole superstructure of Quakerism, by causing the apex of the pyramid to support the base; whilst it involves the inconsistency of trying the correctness of the *higher* rule of faith and practice by the standard of the *lower*. And yet, so inconsistent are the Quakers in this particular, that they will sometimes insist, that the revelation of the inward light is to be measured by the standard of the scriptures, although Barclay has described the infallibility of the dictates of the inward light, and the clearness with which it may be distinguished, in the following express terms: "For that divine and supernatural inward "operation, which the mind doth feel and perceive in itself, "is *the voice of God* speaking unto man, which, by its na-"ture and specific property, is *as clearly distinguished and* "*understood to be the voice of God*, as the voice of Peter "and James is known to be the voice of such men." Again, he describes the Quakers' inward monitor and guide, as "a divine and supernatural revelation, which "is the *voice* or *speech of God*, inwardly speaking to the "ear of the inward man, or mind of man; or A DIVINE

"WRITING SUPERNATURALLY IMPRINTED THEREIN." And to guard against the possibility of confounding the dictates of reason with the supposed influence of the spirit, Barclay, in the same paper, gives, what we might be tempted to designate as the *symptoms of the Quaker disorder*, but what the Friends will, no doubt, consider to be a *charming* account of the breathings of the spirit within, in the following terms:—after showing the operation of *reason* in the perception of any natural or mathematical truth—as, "that the whole is "greater than the part," he proceeds, "but an example "of an inward spiritual sense, is, when the heart or soul of "a pious man feels *within itself* divine emotions, influences "and operations, which, sometimes, are as *the voice and* "*speech of God*—sometimes, as a most pleasant and glorious "illustration, or visible object, to the inward eye—some-"times, as a *most sweet savour and taste*—sometimes, as a "heavenly and divine *warmness* or (so to speak) *melting of* "*the soul in the love of God.*"—What honest Quaker, now, we ask, will either heed or need the instructions of the scriptures, when he believes, that he has within him so *unerring*, so *immaculate* a guide—accompanied with such *sure and certain* signs of infallibility—producing such *emotions*—such *influences* and *operations*—so *pleasant* to the inward eye—so *sweet* and *savory* to the spiritual taste, and kindling, wherewithal, such *warmness* and *melting of the soul!*

In looking through the history of the Society of Friends, the operation of the principle now under examination, will be seen sufficiently developed, in a frequent tendency among a large portion of the Quakers to disregard the doctrines, and throw off the rules and restraints imposed by the scriptures, upon the plea—the correct and just plea upon the Quaker hypothesis—that the dictates of the spirit are paramount to every other authority; whilst the majority of the body, as if ashamed of the consequences of their own creed, have laboured to counteract its natural tendency, and to maintain, even in spite of themselves, the necessity of a submission to the doctrines and precepts of the scriptures. We are aware, that in introducing that class of Quakers first referred to, we shall be told, that they were not *true, orthodox* Quakers, and that their conduct was not the effect of their principles; but these, we would, with submission, observe, are the very issues to be tried; and we are not to take assertions, which may be submitted to the test of argument, upon the authority of an interested party. Now

we shall contend, that the parties whose conduct we shall hereafter notice, *were* true Quakers, and that their rejection of the scriptures *have* been the effect of their principles. And we do think, that when the more prudent Quakers remark the frequent tendency of the members of their body to run into fanaticism and folly, it ought to convince them that the error lies in the system itself. The fountain which frequently sends forth bitter waters, may fairly be suspected of being a polluted one. Sewell, the Quaker historian, in the preface to his work, observes, "It cannot be denied, "that there have been, at times, among this society, some "people of an *odd behaviour*, who, in process of time, "embraced *strange opinions* and *perverse notions*." This, let it be observed, is the admission of a partial and a friendly witness; he adds, however, "But that is no new thing; "since this hath happened also among those of other per-"suasions, though none of these would allow that this was "the consequence or effect of their doctrines." Now, we would observe, that, generally, when those of other persuasions have run into extravagant and absurd conduct such conduct *has* been the effect of their doctrines; but that, in any case, the extenuation, which is sought for by this allusion to other sects, can never be granted to the Quakers, who claim to be *enlightened and directed by the immediate spirit and power of God.* Let this point, which we have, in our former Essay, so much insisted on, be kept constantly in mind by the reader, for we must hold the Quaker to his profession, or he will abandon it to serve a purpose. From the same partial and favourable testimony just quoted, we might extract other evidence bearing on our case. In another part of his preface, Sewell says, "I have not thought myself bound, therefore, to take "notice of *every odd* case that may have happened among "the Quakers, so called."---"Among such particulars, may "be reckoned the case of one Hester Biddle, which *Croese* "makes mention of about the end of his history: For "though it was told him, from the relation she gave of it, "at Amsterdam, not with any intention that he should "publish it; yet, this was *a particular case*, which she, "herself, must be responsible for; since experience hath "taught, that *imagination sometimes works so powerfully on* "*the mind, that one thinks himself obliged to do a thing which* "*were better left undone.*" Now, the case of Esther Biddle is that, quoted in our last from Picart, which, it appears,

was, by him, quoted from Croese.* This lady, it will be remembered, heedless of the retiring character of her sex and in neglect of those home duties, which are enjoined on the woman in the scriptures, went, like another Mrs. Fry, on a mission from heaven to the court of Louis the Fourteenth. This, however absurd—however unsuited to her sex—however inconsistent with the manner in which Deity is recorded, in the scriptures, to have made known his will to the rulers of the earth—was done, as sister Esther Biddle would say, by the direction of the *inward light*. With what consistency, then, can it be said, that for this conduct, "*she, alone, was responsible?*" And of what possible advantage, we would feign know, is this inward light, if, as is asserted by our Quaker authority, "*imagination* "*sometimes works so powerfully on the mind, that one thinks* "*himself obliged to do a thing which were better left undone?*"

This concession, indeed, comprehends nearly our whole case, for, who is to decide between the true influence of the spirit and these false imaginations? Brother Sewell says of Sister Biddle, that her "imagination has led her to do "something, which were better left undone." Sister Biddle might, with equal reason, retort on Brother Sewell in his own words, and treat him as one of those who were of "an "odd behaviour," and who had "embraced strange opinions "and perverse notions." A third brother or sister might, under the supposed influence of the spirit, condemn them both. Now, who shall decide between these? Reason is proscribed—the scriptures are appealed against. It is bare assertion on the one hand against bare assertion on the other. Each declares, that he or she is guided by the spirit of God, but that the other is misled by his "imagination." The only safe way is to believe *half* the assertion of each, by receiving, as true, what each says against the other. This concession, then, of Sewell, it is apparent, commits the whole question of Quakerism; and, exactly as far as we admit it to be true, so far is it, at the same time, fatal to the system it is designed to serve. We may remark further, that this candid admission of the Quaker chronologist is contrary to the authority of Barclay in his letter to Adrian Paets; who, as we have already seen, and as the following extracts will more fully evince, maintains, that the certainty of the

* Crœsii Historia Quakeriana, Tribus Libris comprehensa.

divine operations within us, may not only be distinguished from mere imagination, but that they may be as easily and as clearly known as any natural truth by the outward senses: "But thou wilt say, *how knowest thou that a divine* "*revelation is a divine revelation?* I answer, how knowest "thou that *a whole* is *a whole*, and *a part* is *a part?* I an-"swer again, *even so* a divine revelation is known to be such, "by a supernatural idea of divine revelation raised up in "us, and that by a divine motion or supernatural opera-"tion." This, Barclay afterwards terms a spiritual sense, "which spiritual sense" (he proceeds to observe) "when it "is raised up in us by a divine operation, doth as clearly "and certainly know the voice or revelation of the will of "God, concerning any thing which God is pleased to re-"veal, however contingent, as the outward sense knows "and perceives the outward object." In the case, therefore, of Esther Biddle, we say she received, or, what to all other persons was the same thing, fancied she received this *divine revelation*, and she knew it to be such, or fancied she knew it to be such, by *a spiritual sense*. We maintain, then, not that "*she alone was responsible*" for her conduct, but that *Quakerism alone* was responsible for the same; and so far is it from being true, as Sewell asserts, that Esther Biddle's was a *particular case*, that the truth is, her's was one among a vast variety of similar cases abounding in the Quaker history, and, as we contend, naturally arising from Quaker principles.

To illustrate our position on this subject, we would now advert to the folly and impiety of the Dutch Quakers, about the middle of the seventeenth century, under *Isaac Furnier*. That, under the assumed influence of the spirit, these men violated the best precepts and the most obvious commands of the scriptures, might be attested on the authority of independent historians; we prefer, however, for our present purpose, to confine ourselves to the admissions of their partial chronicler, Sewell.

"W. Caton now arrived at Dort, and from thence repaired to Rotterdam, where, for want of an interpreter that understood English, he was fain to make use of the Latin. But it grieved him exceedingly to meet with some *unruly spirits* there that, having been in some measure convinced by W. Ames, *ran out, under the denomination of Quakers, into extremes both in words and writings*. Some of these persons I know, and have seen the books they gave out in print, in which, under a pretence of plainness, not one *capital letter* was to be found, even not to proper names, not to names of authors themselves. And since they ran out into *several other extravagancies*, it was not much to be wondered, that the magistrates *clapt them up in bedlam*." P. 136.

Speaking of Isaac Furnier, the ringleader of these people, Sewell goes on to say—

"Dr. Galenus hath told me, that this man coming to his door, and finding the *Doctor's* name written on the post of the door, (as is usual in Holland) did with his knife scratch out the letters *Dr.* signifying *Doctor*. On which the Doctor asked him, why he did so? And his answer was, *because the spirit did testify so unto him*. And being asked further, if so be that spirit did move him to stab the Doctor with the knife, whether he would follow that motion? He answered, (if the relation be true) as the Doctor affirmed to me, YES! But however it be, this *is* true, that this Furnier was a passionate and *giddy-headed* man, whom the true Quakers could not own, though he *had translated many of their books out of English into Dutch, and would* ALSO PREACH AMONGST THEM."

The *true* Quakers, as they are here ostentatiously designated, appear to have been mighty fastidious on this occasion; for, what is there in the conduct of Furnier, above recorded, that is contrary either to their practice or their profession? To us, he appears to have been a genuine, consistent, thorough-paced Quaker, determined to follow the inward light in all things, even to the violation of the laws of God as recorded in the scriptures; and this, we maintain, is true Quakerism. He is called, indeed, in the above quotation, by way of reproach, *a giddy-heady man*. In justice, however, to the injured manes of Furnier, we repel the imputation, and seriously declare, that we discover in him no *giddy-headedness*, but what may safely be ascribed to the *giddy inward light* by which he supposed himself to be illuminated!!

The next evidence we would adduce of the tendency of the doctrine of the inward light to supersede and set aside the doctrines and injunctions of the scriptures, is that of James Naylor, briefly noticed in our former Review. The pertinency of this case to our present argument, has, we think, been sufficiently set forth. It amounts to nothing, that the Friends are found to assert, that they disapprove of the conduct of this man; *we*, also, disapprove of his conduct: so far, there is no difference between us—the only question at issue being—was his conduct the result of his principles? We maintain the affirmative of this question; in support of which we may remark, that, from an examination of the various and conflicting statements that have appeared concerning this singular case, we incline to believe, that this man was, from the beginning to the end, *strictly sincere*. Throughout all the distressing examinations he underwent, he appears to have justified his conduct by reference to the principles of his sect; and he endured the

horrible and protracted cruelties which were inflicted on him by the Parliament, with a fortitude and patience, which can only be explained by his inward persuasion of being in the right. In a word, we think the case of Naylor, a striking and melancholy illustration of the operation of the principles of his sect, on a mind more susceptable, and an imagination more ardent than others of his party. It was the true inward light, and inward heat too, although, perhaps, struck out and burning in the midst of more inflammable materials than are often, now-a-days, deposited in a Quaker bosom. The following extracts, collected from Sewell, will shew that this unfortunate and miserable fanatic collected from among the Friends a body of followers and admirers; that he was, in fact, the god of their idolatry; and that, under the supposed impulse of the inward spirit they, contrary to God's word, "*worshipped and served the creature* "*more than the Creator, who is blessed for ever.*"

"Hannah Stranger" (says Sewell) "whom I knew very well, and have reason to believe, a woman of *high imaginations*,* wrote in this time several extravagant letters to him, (Naylor) calling him the *everlasting son of righteousness; Prince of Peace; the only begotten son of God; the fairest of ten thousand, &c.* In the letters of Jane Woodstock, John Stranger, and others, were expressions of the like extravagancy. The said Hannah Stranger, Martha Simmons, and Dorcas Erbury, arrived at that height of folly, that in the prison at Exeter, *they kneeled before Naylor and kissed his feet;* he was already too much *transported*, and grew yet more exorbitant; for being released from that prison, and riding to Bristol at the beginning of November, he was accompanied by the aforesaid, and other persons, and passing through the suburbs of Bristol, one Thomas Woodcock went bareheaded before him, one of the women led his horse; Dorcas, Martha, and Hannah, spread their scarfs and handkerchiefs before him, and the company sung, *Holy, holy, holy is the Lord God of Hosts, hosannah in the highest; holy, holy, holy is the Lord God of Israel.* Thus, these *mad people (Quakers)* sung whilst they were walking through the mire and dirt, till they came into Bristol, where they were examined by the magistrates, and committed to prison." p. 138—9.

During the trial of Naylor by the parliament, Sewell states, that

"There lived in London, one *Robert Rich*, a merchant, a very bold man, who wrote a letter to the parliament, wherein he shewed what was blasphemy; and on the 15th of December, several copies thereof were delivered to particular members; and in that which was given to the Speaker, these words were written at the bottom. *If I may have liberty of those that sit in parliament, I do here attend at their door, and am ready, out of the scriptures of truth, to show that not any thing J. Naylor hath said or done, is blasphemy.*"

On the 27th of December, when Naylor was placed a second time in the pillory, and had his tongue bored and

* Query—*full of the spirit?*

his forehead branded, this Rich, we are informed by Sewell, stood with him on the scaffold, and "*licked his wounds.*" From the report of Naylor's trial, published by the Quakers, 1657, we learn, p. 41, what Sewell thinks fit to pass over in silence, that Rich affixed a paper over Naylor's pillory, written in these words "*This is Jesus, the King of the Jews.*" Sewell, indeed, calls Rich "a bold man," "a forward man," &c.; and it is true he was afterwards disowned by the Quakers, but it is important to observe, he was not disowned for any conduct exhibited by him with regard to Naylor, but from his venturing aftewards to differ with George Fox:—Rich contending, in strict accordance with the Quaker system, that every man was bound to follow his own light as a sufficient guide; and Fox insisting, that *his* light within possessed a prior claim to the submission of the Society of Friends. But it appears clear that even the founder of Quakerism was himself, at one time, an approver of the folly and blasphemy of Naylor, as, up to the time of his suffering the punishment decreed by parliament for his conduct, George's spirit was moved within him to indite sundry papers, in which, with much solemnity and scripture quoting, he vindicated every claim that Naylor had made, and fully justified the adoration of his followers, upon the plea, that they worshipped only "*the spirit of God*" or "*Christ within*" this crack-brained enthusiast. These papers will be found in the report of the trial above referred to. They are all written in Fox's own peculiar and inimitable style of spiritual pedantry and rude self-claimed importance. One addressed to the Protector, commences thus:—

"To the Protector, and to you who are chosen by these nations to be parliament of England, to divide, rule and govern things—*this is the word of the Lord to you.* Take heed of acting against CHRIST *where he is made manifest.* Take heed of acting or doing any thing against them that be in the pure religion, or acting any thing against religion: how know you that the thing is fallen out to try you, whether or no you act against Christ, where he is made manifest in his members, for it is said *Christ in you, &c.?* therefore take heed, I am moved to warn and charge you in the presence of the Lord God, (ye rulers and magisirates of the nation) least ye be found acting against *the spirit of the Father, where he speaks in such as are brought before you.*"

In another paper, issued before the punishment of Naylor, Fox says, with the evident view of justifying Naylor's conduct,

"Did not the apostle say, examine yourselves, prove yourselves; know ye not that Jesus Christ is in you, except ye be reprobates; (mark) *Jesus Christ in you*—the Emanuel—the Saviour—the Lamb of God—the Hosannah. Is

not his appearance in the spirit as glorious in *his second coming*, as it was at his first? Is it not as much to be admired in the world, as it was ever? Answer these things and satisfy yourselves?"

And in another paper, justifying those who prostrated themselves before Naylor, that as we bow to an earthly judge, so we may "*bow to Christ where he is manifest*," Fox indignantly asks, "*whether or no you will suffer Christ* "*to have as much honour in the earth and the world, as the devil* "*hath?*" Thus, then, it appears that Fox himself was an approver of the conduct of Naylor and his companions, but when sentence was passed upon this miserable maniac, and his insanity had become evident to all the world, he *then* found it prudent, in order that his followers might not be any further compromised by the *ultra* absurdities of Naylor's *light within*, to drop the cause he had hitherto supported; and, in common with the majority of the shrewder Quakers, to deliver Naylor over to the pity or contempt of society. Conduct such as this is what, in the common business of life, would be denominated as *shuffling*, *dishonest* and *disgraceful*; and can it *lessen* our disdain of such conduct, to be told that it was dictated by the SPIRIT OF GOD?

As for Naylor himself, to what extent he ever felt and admitted himself to have acted contrary to his profession in the above conduct, is a matter of great uncertainty. A recantation of his errors was, indeed, published in his name, which, however, he afterwards disclaimed and pronounced to be a forgery. It is certain he allowed, that his mind had been improperly lifted up; but this he attributes, in part at least, to the cause to which we are willing to refer it—his supposed inward revelation;—he had "*divers messages*;" he says, which came to him, "*some true and some false*;" and with the true "*I let in*" (says he) "*the false message also*." It is true, as Sewell has said, that Naylor wrote "to apologize for the doctrine of which he had made profession, "and to shew, that the fault of his crime must no ways be "attributed to the same, as many envious persons in those "times asserted, *to wit*, that his fall was *a consequence* of the "doctrine, that men must take heed to the *saving grace*—the "*inward anointing, or the light wherewith every man coming* "*into the world is enlightened from God*." But, unfortunately for the Society of Friends, a luckless writer of their own party had suffered the truth to escape, and had, unwittingly, sanctioned the prevailing suspicion of all sensible men as to the cause of Naylor's conduct. *J. Wyeth*, in his *Anguis Flagel*, had stated, that "J. Naylor was a man who had

" been highly favoured of God with a good degree of grace, " which was sufficient for him had he kept to his teachings; " for, while he did so, he was exemplary in godliness " and great humility; was powerful in word and doctrine, " and thereby instrumental in the hand of God for turning " many from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan " to the power of God. But he, poor man, became exalted " above measure THROUGH THE ABUNDANCE OF REVELA- " TION; and, in that exaltation, did depart from the grace " and holy spirit of God, *which had been his sufficient teacher.*" Wyeth, it is evident, had, in this instance, if we may use the terms of common parlance, *let the cat out of the bag;* for, it is obvious, and that is what we are contending for, that the whole of Naylor's extravagance and blasphemy proceeded from the *abundance of revelation!* or rather, of *revelation so called!* Let not the modern Quakers say, we condemn the conduct of Naylor and his followers, unless they also abandon that system which produced such conduct; for, we would ask, did ever any man or set of men in this world, exhibit equal folly and impiety in the name of religion, who have *not* believed in the Quaker doctrine of inward immediate revelation, or in some hypothesis analogous thereto? And can any better evidence be given of the utter uselessness of the supposed possession of this light within, than that afforded in the instance of Naylor—the defence and apology for whose conduct, rests upon his inability to distinguish that light from the imagined whisperings of *Satanic influence?* When, also, it is considered, that the spirit has to dispute the possession of the Quaker's inward tenement, not only with the Devil, but also, as the Friends suppose, with corrupt and fallen reason; the chances against such powerful defendants, are, really, two to one, that the plaintiff should be *nonsuited.*

Passing over many other instances which might be adduced, of the tendency of Quakerism to supersede the authority and doctrines of the scriptures, we will refer to the separation from the friends of Wilkinson and Story (two members of the body) with their followers, in the north of England, about 1683. These parties objected to the discipline and order established among the Friends; and, however consonant such discipline might be to the authority of the scriptures; or the example of the first christian church, yet they declared, says Sewell, (page 583) " That such meetings were *needless,* and that every one " ought to be guided by *the spirit of God in his own mind,*

"and not to be guided by rules of man." Undoubtedly!—And repugnant as is this sentiment to the scriptures, and, even to the existence of a christian community, what Quaker will gainsay it? Should any one venture to assert that this principle is contrary to Quakerism, nothing would be more easy than to overwhelm him with a weight of authorities drawn from all the chief writers of the sect! Referring to this same division among the Friends, Sewell remarks, page 584,

"Hence arose a schism or rent first in the North of England; and some, who went under the denomination of separatists, began to keep meetings by themselves, and so to leave their former friends, though they pretended *to agree with them in matters of doctrine.* To these separatists resorted such as were not of strict lives, and therefore were unwilling to submit to church discipline. For this was now become the common saying of these people, *that every one having received a measure of the spirit of God, ought to regard that leader without minding any rules prescribed by others.*"

Certainly! And in this they *did* agree with the Friends in matters of doctrine—this is a consequence not only flowing directly from Quakerism, but it has been, as we have already seen, expressed by Barclay, almost in so many words—for "*where the true inward knowledge of God* "*is through the revelation of his spirit,* THERE IS ALL; "*neither is there any absolute necessity of any other.*" No better evidence need be afforded, of the danger of the principle we are combatting, than that the Friends themselves should be compelled to denounce those who have acted most consistently with their own principles of belief.

A more remarkable instance of this will be found to have taken place soon after the above case, in the differences between the celebrated *George Keith* and the Society of Friends. Into the particulars of this important controversy, it is not our intention to enter; indeed, most of the records of these transactions are too highly coloured by party feeling, to enable us to arrive at a safe conclusion upon their opposing statements.

Mosheim (Ecc. His. vol. 5, p. 476) says, in reference to this event,

"The European *Quakers* dare not presume so far upon the indulgence of the civil and ecclesiastical powers, as to deny openly the *reality* of the history of the life, mediation, and sufferings of Christ; but in *America*, where they have nothing to fear, they are *said* to express themselves without ambiguity on this subject, and to maintain publicly, that *Christ never existed but in the hearts of the faithful.*"

Now, we have already seen from Barclay, that "the "historical faith and knowledge of the birth, death, life,

"resurection, and ascension of Christ" are not *essential* to Christianity—that, therefore, some of the Friends in America *did* hold the sentiment, attributed to them by Mosheim, is probable, because it is consistent with the principles of their creed. With this introduction we will direct attention to the following extract from Bishop Burnet.

"The Quakers have had a great breach among them, by one George Keith, a Scotchman, with whom I had my first education at Aberdeen; he had been thirty-six years among them; he was esteemed the most learned man that ever was in that sect. He was sent to Pennsylvania (a colony set up by Penn, where they are very numerous) to have the chief direction of the education of their youth. In those parts he said he first discovered that which had been always either denied to him, or so disguised that he did not suspect it; but being far out of reach, and in a place where they were masters, they spoke out their mind plainer, and it appeared to him *that they were Deists, and that they turned the whole doctrine of the christian religion into allegories;* chiefly those which relate to the death and resurrection of Christ and the reconciliation of sinners to God, by virtue of his cross. He being a true christian, set himself with great zeal against this, upon which they grew weary of him and sent him back to England. At his return he set himself to read many of their books, and then he discovered the mystery which was formerly so hid from him that he had not observed it; upon this he opened a new meeting, and by a printed summons, he called the whole party to come and see the proof that he had to offer, to convince them of these. Few Quakers came to his meetings, but great multitudes of other people flocked about him. He brought the *Quaker's books* with him, and read such passages out of them, as convinced his hearers that he had not charged them falsely. He continued these meetings, being still in outward appearance a Quaker, for some years, till, having prevailed as far as he saw any probability of success, he laid aside their exterior, and was reconciled to the church, and is now in holy orders among us, and likely to do good service in undeceiving and reclaiming some of those misled enthusiasts."—*History of his own Times*, vol. 2, p. 249, London 1734.

Thus far from Mosheim and Burnet, who, as they were neither of them parties to the dispute, we have selected as the most independent authorities. Upon turning to Sewell, we find, that Keith is accused of violence, and branded as a schismatic and an apostate. All this may be true; but it is not denied, that Keith did accuse the Quakers of *Pennsylvania* with a disbelief of the facts of the gospel, and that he did oppose them on that account; nor does Sewell himself venture, as an historian, to deny the accusation brought against them: his words are, "He accused them, that they "had said, that *the light within was sufficient to salvation* "*without any thing else;* from whence he endeavoured "to prove, that they excluded the man Jesus Christ, as "not necessary to salvation: but *they* denied this to be "their doctrine." (Page 640.) Now, the premises we have

proved, beyond all question, to be strict Quakerism; and the *inference* imputed, is so obvious, that it can hardly be supposed, but what it should have been drawn. In order to enable them to refute the charge of disbelief, which Keith had brought against the Quakers of *Pennsylvania*, it appears, that he proposed a certain test or confession of faith, to be subscribed by all Quakers. These articles of faith went expressly to declare the *reality* of some of the leading facts and doctrines of the gospel—the Friends in America *refused* subscription to these; indeed, rather than they would do this, Keith was disowned. From the decision of the Friends in America, he appealed, as appears from Gough's History of the Quakers, to the yearly meeting of London, 1694, "which was solemnly heard and debated "for many days, and at last determined in a *moderate* "censure upon him."* It does not appear, from any authentic records of the Society of Friends, that Keith was accused of any errors in doctrine, whilst we have seen some, which were passed at that time, which recognised the existence of those errors which he had charged on the Friends of Pennsylvania; the issue, however, of these differences was, that Keith *withdrew* from the Society of Friends with his adherents, who, as a reproach on the imputed scepticism of the parent body, designated themselves "Christian Quakers;" and subscribed, as a condition of membership, to the articles, consisting only of seven, and these extremely brief, which had been drawn up by George Keith.

A modern and acute writer, the author of "*An Appeal to*

* The proceedings of the American Quakers towards Keith, were published by him in England 1692, in a work entitled, "New England's Spirit of Persecution, transmitted to Pennsylvania; and the *pretended Quaker*, found persecuting the *true Christian Quaker*, in the trial of Peter Boss, George Keith," &c. By this it appears that Keith though supported by an equal number of the monthly meetings, was tried before the meeting of *ministers*, consisting of twenty-eight individuals, who passed sentence upon him the 20th of the 4th month, 1692, as "*a person without the fear of God before his eyes.*" In consequence of the decision of these ministers, a pamphlet was published by Keith and his party, entitled "An appeal from the twenty eight judges to the spirit of truth." The Quakers, forbidden by their principles to use coersion, discovered, it appears, in this case, '*the art of ingeniously tormenting;*' for, as some of these ministers held commissions in the peace, what they could not do as *Quakers* they did as *Magistrates;* and Keith, Bradford, and other of the separatists, were cast into prison for publishing defences of themselves *without license.* The prosecution, it seems, was continued for some time against Keith and his party, and was only terminated by Colonel Fletcher being appointed Governor of Pennsylvania, in the room of William Penn.

"*the Society of Friends on the Primitive simplicity of their* "*Christian Principles*," &c. 1801, appears, mistakenly as we think, to award his approbation to those of the Friends who refused to subscribe to Keith's articles, which he considers to have been an attempt to impose *a test of orthodoxy* on the Society of Friends.* Now, for ourselves, though we abominate the name of a creed or confession of faith; though we deprecate the idea of tests and articles, that is by reason of our own imperfect nature—because, in fact, *we* are fallible men, and cannot hope, as such, to bring the various and erring judgments which are to be found in all communities out of the pale of Quakerism, to one exact and perfect standard of thought and opinion. But the case is widely different with the Quakers, who, to a man, profess to be directed in the way of truth by one infallible, unerring power, namely, the light of God within them, and who might, therefore, adopt and subscribe to one uniform and perfect confession of *their* belief. Nor is it a little singular, that this sect, which is the only one that could consistently promulgate and subscribe to a creed, is more wary in this particular, than any other class of professors; so much so, that their doctrinal opinions on some points of first importance, as that of the Trinity and Atonement, have long been the subject of the most laborious and learned controversies, and must, in fact, ever continue so, for this sufficient reason — that they are really unknown to the Friends themselves; a natural consequence this, of their disregard of scriptural authority, and of their following, in preference thereto, the dictates of their own imagination; professing themselves to be wise, they have become fools; and mistake their own *mental darkness* for the light within!

Returning, however, from this digression: it does appear, that Keith, a man of undoubted learning, and long in union with the Quakers, did accuse a large portion of the Quakers of Pennsylvania with disregarding and rejecting the fundamental facts of the gospel; that he was by them disowned; that he appealed to the Friends in London, who did *not* confirm the resolution of those of Philadelphia; and who did not charge him, on the other hand, with any error in doctrine; that he proposed a confession of faith, designed to exclude the unbelief, which he had charged on the Friends of Pennsylvania; that subscription to this was

* The anxiety of the Friends of our own times to *maintain* a test of orthodoxy, and of modern orthodoxy too, may be noticed in its proper place.

refused; on which account, he ultimately withdrew from the Society of Friends. And here it may be important to observe, that the new meeting, mentioned by Burnet as being opened by Keith, was a meeting called by him at *Turner's Hall*, long before he seceded from the Quakers; at which meeting, he challenged the whole Quaker body, with all their learned men, Penn, Whitehead, and others, to meet him in open discussion; when he professed his readiness to substantiate the accusation against the Pennsylvania Quakers, as to their disbelief of the facts and doctrines of the gospel; and to prove, that the writings of the principal authors of the body, led to and justified such disbelief. This meeting, so called by Keith, was, as is confessed by Sewell, declined by the Quakers—none of their leading men ventured to meet their opponent face to face, or to disprove his accusation before a public tribunal; thus exhibiting by their conduct, but too evident a consciousness of their own weakness, and of the truth of the charges propounded against them. The Quakers did, however, publish their reasons for refusing to meet their opponent. These were principally, that *Keith was passionate and abusive in his manner;* that *it was not an agreed meeting on both sides;* that *he had not sent them a copy of the charge against them;* that *such public meetings are often attended with heats, levity, and confusion;* and that *for the sake of religion, the liberty granted to the body, and the civil peace, they decline the meeting.* (See Sewell, p. 660.)—*The spirit* by which the Quakers are influenced is wonderfully changeable; for, of all these reasons, it may be safely asserted, that if, perchance, they had been governed by them at an earlier period, Quakerism had never existed; as it is notorious, that in defiance of all the prudential maxims now suggested, *(by the spirit no doubt)* Fox and Burroughs, and Howgill and Dewsbury, and Penn and Whitehead, and, indeed, all the chief apostles of their church, had, by the influence of that same spirit, as they assert, and their followers believe, openly and publicly, and without agreement or consent, and without regard to the tempers of their adversaries or fear of the laws, debated and disputed with Catholics, Churchmen, and Anabaptists—at the mass houses, the meeting-houses, the steeple-houses—in the courts of law, the market places, and the highways—through good report and evil report—in season and out of season! The Quakers, then, we maintain, were bound by their own principles, and according to their own practice, to meet their opponent, when accused of so grave an offence, as the denying the doctrines of

Christianity; and we may rest assured, that for the sake even of common consistency, they would have done this but for a well-grounded apprehension, that their faith would not bear the test of public examination; and that he, who was so well versed in the system, was likely to assail it in the most vulnerable parts! Nothing can relieve the Quakers from the force of this conclusion, except, indeed, it be urged, as we have intimated, that they were moved by the spirit not to meet their opponent on this occasion; in which case, as it becomes not us to question anything that is done by the spirit, we shall merely remark, that the moving of this sort of *amendment* on its own *previous motion*, proved singularly opportune and greatly convenient to the Society of Friends! It is true, that, in answer to the arguments which Keith continued to level against them at Turner's Hall, the Quakers did publish a declaration of their belief in the doctrines and truths they were accused of denying; and we do not deny, that the majority of them may believe in the doctrines of the gospel, and admit, at least in practice, the authority of the scriptures; but this, we say, is an *inconsistency* in the sect; it in no way results from their creed. The theoretical tendency of their faith, is to produce an opposite result; and such has been frequently, and to a great extent, its practical operations! We shall conclude our chain of evidence, designed to prove the position, that the doctrine of the inward light is subversive of scripture truth, by reference to a modern instance; we allude to the conduct of the Friends towards Hannah Barnard. This case, it will be seen, is peculiarly to our purpose: and, unhappily for the *meek* and peaceful profession of Quakerism, it exhibits its professors in the odious character of persecutors for conscience sake. The facts are briefly these:—In 1799, Hannah Barnard, a Quakeress, of Hudson, New York, America, arrived in England. She was a woman of great zeal and integrity, united with knowledge and perseverance; she had had *a call* from the Lord "*to* "*pay a religious visit to the Friends in Great Britain and* "*Ireland;*" and, in obedience to the heavenly mandate, she left house, and country, and husband, and children, and arrived in this country, bringing with her testimonials from the monthly, quarterly, and yearly meetings of ministers and elders, among whom she had been a member; in which it was declared, that her "*ministry had been sound and edifying, attended with a comfortable evidence of her call thereto.*" (Appeal to the Society of Friends, &c. p. 43.) In process of time, it was discovered by the London Friends,

that Hannah's sentiments were not sufficiently orthodox; her heresy consisted in her fidelity to her principles; she followed the leadings of the spirit to the rejection of the scriptures; she rejected some portion of the Old Testament; and did not believe in the miracles of the New. The portion of the Old Testament which she denounced, was the commands of Moses to the Israelites to make war on and expatriate the idolatrous and brutalized inhabitants of Canaan; commands, which we have accustomed ourselves to esteem as founded in divine wisdom and justice, calculated to teach a great moral lesson to those who were made the instruments of the divine displeasure against idolatry, and all its concomitant crimes; and necessary for the establishment of the worship of the One True God, and the display of his power to the surrounding nations of the earth. But Hannah's spirit testified differently. With regard, also, to the miracles of Christ, the great evidence of his divine commission, whilst she did not positively deny these, yet she said, "I freely confess my ignorance as to their *positive* "and *literal certainty*, which I could only be assured of by "*immediate revelation*; and as such evidence has *not* been "given me, I have that reason, at least, to believe, it has "not, as yet, been absolutely necessary for me to know as "an individual, in relation to myself, nor yet for my qualifi-"cations as a gospel messenger to others." (Appeal, &c. p. 60) This is *scepticism* it is true, but it is, we maintain, *Quaker scepticism;* it is the legitimate offspring of the system. Hannah was put upon her trial and finally sent back to America, and branded with public disgrace for her heresy; but it must be confessed, that throughout every stage of the harsh and protracted measures that were adopted against her, she exhibited the dexterity of a special pleader, united with the constancy of the martyr. She rested her defence upon the *principles of Quakerism*, she *quoted triumphantly from Barclay*, and the whole stream of Quaker authorities, the paramount and all-sufficient authority of the inward light which induced one of the ministers who had attended the several sittings to confess, "We fought Hannah with very "simple weapons—for at *reasoning she was quite too many* "*for us all.*" In a word, Hannah stuck to her text; she pleaded against every accusation, the sufficiency of the inspirations of the inward spirit; and was, at length, contrary to every principle of Quakerism, and to the lasting disgrace of the body, found guilty of what could only be correctly designated as a *provoking consistency with her creed!* Can the reader contemplate a proceeding like this,

without a conviction of the utter fallacy of the system in which it originates;—a sensible and sincere woman follows out her profession *to its just and natural extent*, and the whole body, from vengeance, or at best, from shame, rise up in arms against her, and hunt her from that society, to whose principles she had been the most faithful.

We have now, as we think, produced sufficient evidence from the system of Quakerism itself, from the commentaries of its expositors, and from its practical effects, to prove the point proposed in this paper—that its grand and distinguishing doctrine, of a constant and immediate revelation to the mind of man, is calculated to supersede the authority of the scriptures, and to sap away the foundations of christianity itself. The tendency of superstition to scepticism, and the approximation of fanaticism to infidelity, is no where so strongly marked, as in the history of Quakerism. The Quakers—many of the Quakers—as we have seen, have, to use the words of Burnet, "*turned the whole doctrine of the christian religion into allegories.*" Volney, Sir William Drummond, and other infidel writers have done the same with regard to revelation generally. Hannah Barnard who, under the supposed influence of the spirit, denies the divine authority for the wars of the Jews against the Canaanites, and cannot admit the miracles of Christ, arrives only at the same conclusion to which Paine and Hume have come before her; and Carlile, the ultra infidel of the day, whilst he exalts by his abuse the body of Freethinking Christians, claims, we observe, our friend Mrs. Fry, as professing a kindred creed with his own; for, in a letter addressed by this vain man to this pious lady, he states with evident satisfaction, "*the Quakers, I understand, respect but little of the bible beyond its moral parts;*" and he afterwards observes, with singular truth and candour, "*I allow the Quakers to approach nearest to* MY PRINCIPLES *of all the christian sects!!!**

---

* See the Republican, Oct. 24, 1823.—Notwithstanding Carlile's predelection for Quakerism, as avowed in this letter to Mrs. Fry, he admits that there are some shades of difference between himself and the Quakers; and Mrs. Fry is candidly invited to Dorchester goal, to discuss the points which prevent a cordial union between the disciples of George Fox and those of Richard Carlile. Should Mrs. Fry, with this object, visit Dorcester goal, which we trust she will do, and which we really think would be quite as useful as any other of her goal visits, we shall be curious to learn the result between the *philosopher* and the *saint*—the *prison hero* and *heroine*; we confess we observe many points of similarity, and we think it a pity that any minor differences should separate two such *conspicuous* individuals.

Such is the injury to religion produced by the doctrine of internal revelation—of the inward light—a doctrine the offspring of vanity and ignorance, and which has proved in its effects to be the most successful invention that ingenious folly has ever devised for the destruction of plain scripture truth, the encouragement of superstition, and the growth of spritual pride. Turning to the christian religion, how clear and simple does it appear to the mind of man, when compared with the confused and wavering dogmas of this mystical theology. Its truths, once revealed to the world, and established by divine authority, become sufficient to all the purposes of faith and godliness. It requires no supplementary revelation, because it is in itself complete. It asks no additional evidence from heaven, because that with which it was first accompanied is sufficient. It needs no supernatural commentary, because its doctrines are simple and free from mystery. It is addressed to the reason and natural perceptions of man, because these are competent to understand it—to discern its excellencies, and to weigh its evidences. The thought may, indeed, be bold, and we hazard it with all reverence, that even if Deity were miraculously to communicate christianity to the mind of man, a better knowledge could not thereby be obtained of its spirit, its nature, and its truths, than by those natural means which, in his wisdom, he has thought sufficient for us. Christianity consists, as we have before said, in certain plain facts, and in certain simple principles arising out of them. "*This*," says the apostle, "*is the word of faith which we* "*preach; that if thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord* "*Jesus, and shall believe in thy heart that God hath raised him* "*from the dead, thou shalt be saved.*" (Rom. x. 9.) This confession and this belief, carrying of course with them a submission to the laws and obedience to the precepts of Jesus, is christianity. This clear and simple system of divine revelation we receive as true, not from a succession of revelations from God, or from our own internal impulses—but from the weight of historical and moral evidence in its favour—from its intrinsic excellence—its agreement with the character of God—its suitability to the condition of man, and from the miraculous evidences with which it was originally attested. Miracles, however, are an appeal to reason—to reason in the first degree, for they are addressed to the *senses*, which are the inlets to reason and judgment. The light then of the gospel is the only true *light within;* it is light and knowledge infused into the mind by the natural operation of the truths of christianity—the motives it sup-

plies, and the hopes which it inspires. We conclude this paper in the following peculiarly appropriate and judicious remarks of Mr. Locke, to which we direct the special attention of the Friends generally.

"He, therefore, that will not give himself up to all the extravagancies of delusion and error, must bring this guide of the *light within* to the trial. God, when he makes the prophet, does not unmake the man: he leaves all his faculties in their natural state to enable him to judge of his inspirations, whether they be of divine original or no. When he illuminates the mind with supernatural knowledge, he does not extinguish that which is natural. If he would have us assent to the truth of any proposition, he either evidences that truth by the usual methods of natural reason, or else makes it known to be a truth which he would have us assent to by his authority, and convinces us that it is from him by some marks which reason cannot be mistaken in. *Reason must be our last judge and guide in every thing.* I do not mean that we must consult reason and examine whether a proposition revealed from God can be made out by natural principles, and if it cannot; that then we may reject it; but *consult it we must, and by it examine whether it be a revelation from God or no*; and if reason finds it to be revealed from God, reason then declares for it as much as for any other truth, and makes it one of her dictates. Every conceit that thoroughly warms our fancies, must pass for an inspiration, if there be nothing but the strength of our persuasions, whereby to judge of our persuasions. If reason must not examine their truth by something extrinsical to the persuasions themselves, *inspirations and delusions, truth and falsehood, will have the same measure and will not be possible to be distinguished.*"

"If this *internal light*, or any other proposition, which under that title we take for inspired, be comformable to the principles of reason, or to the word of God, which is attested revelation, *reason* warrants it and we may safely receive it for true, and be guided by it in our belief and actions. If it receive no testimony nor evidence from either of these rules, we cannot take it for a revelation, or so much as for true, till we have some other mark that it is a revelation, besides our believing that it is so. Thus, we see, the holy men of old, who had revelations from God, had something else besides that internal light of assurance in their own minds, to testify to them that it was from God. They were not left to their own persuasions alone that those persuasions were from God, but had *outward signs* to convince them of the author of those revelations. And when they were to convince others they had a power given them to justify the truth of their commission from heaven, and by *visible signs* to assert the divine authority of a message they were sent with. Moses saw the bush burn without being consumed. and heard a voice out of it. This was something besides finding *an impulse upon his mind to go to Pharoah* that he might bring his brethren out of Egypt; and yet he thought not this enough to authorize him to go with that message, till God, by another miracle of his rod turning into a serpent, had assured him of a power to testify his mission by the same miracle repeated before them whom he was sent to."—*Locke on the Human Understanding*, chap. xix. *Of Enthusiasm.*

QUAKER INCONSISTENCIES will form the subject of our next article.

NOTICES.

PROSECUTION FOR LIBEL.—Our Readers have collected, from a former Notice, the fact of actions having been commenced by Mr. Rice, curate of St. Luke's, against the Printer of this Work, and the Author of the article entitled "*Dissenters' Marriages*," for an imputed Libel contained in that article. When the information was made to us that some portion of the article, as far as regarded Dr. Rice, was deemed by him to be false and unfounded, the Solicitors of the parties made an immediate offer to insert any contradiction signed by Dr. Rice, of any imputation, but which Dr. Rice declined to write; and requiring that it should be explained by the Author or the Printer of the Article.

The declarations in the cause, from which a knowledge of the passage or passages charged as libelous could alone be collected, having been delivered since the publication of our last Number, we learn that the proceedings are directed against some observations in a note affixed to the Article entitled Dissenters' Marriages; in which allusion is made to the neglect of certain canons of the church, as the common practice of clergymen. Dr. Rice, we are sorry to find by his declarations, considered that the article in question imputed to him that he "had given himself to drink and riot—"spending his time idly by day and by night—playing at dice, cards, tables, and "other unlawful games," and that "he had been guilty of resorting to a tavern or "ale-house." A love of truth and sense of duty, however, lead the Author and Printer of the article to declare most unequivocally their conviction that the construction put by Dr. Rice, upon the remarks in question, is not borne out by the actual circumstances of the case; as the Author never meant to attribute to Dr. Rice, and, in fact, never did attribute to him, that he gave himself to drinking, to playing at dice, cards, &c. and he has found upon inquiry that Dr. Rice is certainly not in the habit of frequenting any house of public entertainment, and, therefore, he has no hesitation in availing himself of the first opportunity offered him of utterly disavowing the application of the observation to Dr. Rice, and in such sentiments the Printer and ourselves most cordially concur.

The COMMUNICATION on the subject of the QUAKERS has been received—any farther facts from the same writer, who appears well versed in the operations of the *Inward light* on the other side of the Atlantic, will be useful, provided they are well authenticated.

The CHRISTIAN MORALIST is highly creditable to the feelings of the writer—our apprehension is, that we cannot devote sufficient room to the effusions of his Muse—it is at present under consideration.

"OBSERVATOR'S" proposal, however well meant, does not accord with our views of duty or utility.

THE following Subjects are appointed by the Church of God, for the instruction of the Public on the Sunday Mornings, at their Meeting-house, Crescent, Jewin Street, Aldersgate Street.—Time of commencing 11 o'Clock PRECISELY.

1824

Jan. 4.—Christianity—its power and simplicity.

Jan. 11.—An Exposure of the Work entitled—"*Not Paul but Jesus.*"

Jan. 18.—Same subject continued.

Jan. 25.—The Characters of Abraham, Moses, Jesus, and Paul; with a view to shew the fitness of each for the office he had to fulfil, and the uniformity of plan which prevailed in the dispensations of the Deity, of which they were the appointed instruments.

Feb. 1.—The character and attributes of Deity—the doctrines of the scriptures on this subject compared with the works of nature.

Feb. 8.—An inquiry into the truth of the position—that "Christianity is part and parcel of the law of the land."

Feb. 15.—The doctrine of the Atonement in connection—*firstly*, with the alleged Fall of Man—*secondly*, with the nature of Sacrifice.

Feb. 22.—Unitarianism *not* Christianity.

Feb. 29.—An address to Youth—founded upon the Parable of the Prodigal Son.

Mar. 7.—The Priesthood of modern times—(established and dissenting)—an inquiry into its authority from the institution of the Jewish Priesthood, and from the example of Jesus and his Apostles.

Mar. 14.—Deism and Atheism—their causes and tendency.

Mar. 21.—"The Lord's Supper."

Mar. 28.—The Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England and the Eighty-two Questions of the Bishop of Peterborough examined.

H. Hetherington, Printer, 13, Kingsgate Street, Holborn.

THE

FREETHINKING

CHRISTIANS'

QUARTERLY REGISTER.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE FALL OF MAN DISPROVED,

By an Explanation of the early part of the Book of Genesis

ESSAY III.

IN the former Essay (p. 1) we have seen our first parents dismissed from their school of instruction, called paradise, and placed in that world which was to be peopled and cultivated by an innumerable race descending from this one pair; and where all those lessons which that pair had learned in the garden of Eden were to be called into action, and all their powers and faculties matured by difficulties and experience. Let us now take a retrospective view of the short—the simple, but beautiful and instructive narrative which we have been explaining; a narrative which, in the brief space of three chapters, comprises, with respect to our globe and all that inhabit, or belong to it (man excepted), most probably the history of ages; and which, with regard to man himself, evidently embraces many years. But, in order to have a clear conception of the interest and beauty of this narrative, it will be, first, necessary to characterize the two beings that form the leading features of the story,

viz. God the creator, and man the creature; of each of whom we may, indeed, say with the Poet—

> "And first of God above, or man below,
> What can we reason but from what we know?"

Or rather, from what our senses and experience teach—or Deity condescends to communicate to us.

First, then, of God—all his works—all our experience—all his communications to mankind—proclaim him to be infinitely wise, powerful, and good; they teach us that he is "*the Lord, gracious and merciful;*" that "*he is good to all;*" that "*his tender mercies are over all his works;*" that he is the bountiful protector and preserver of man, of the brute tribe, and of all the creatures that he has made; that he is a being who has left nothing to chance or contingency; that, at once in the physical and the moral world, every event, whether we call it good or evil, is the result of foreknowledge on his part, of design and pre-ordination; that every thing is so arranged, and bound round with proper circumstances, as to fulfil all his pleasure and accomplish all his purposes; and that all his plans and dispensations are marked by wisdom, mercy, and benevolence. With these exalted and just views of the character of our beneficent Creator, we have a solid ground to rest upon; a criterion by which to try—a clue by which to trace out and solve every apparent difficulty; and however, to us short-sighted mortals, any thing may appear obscure or difficult, we may rest assured that it must and will all correspond with the attributes thus ascribed to Deity; redound to his glory, and promote, either immediately or ultimately, the good and happiness of the creatures he has formed. Impressed with these sublime views, the apostle Paul, when contemplating the weakness, the sinfulness, and the sufferings of mankind, consoles himself and others by telling us (Rom. viii. 20) that "*the whole creation was made subject to "vanity,*" (imperfection) "*not willingly,*" (or of choice on the part of the creature) "*but by reason of Him,*" (the creator) "*who*" (for wise and gracious purposes) "*hath "subjected the same in* HOPE; *that the whole creation also*" (as well as the first fruits) "*shall be delivered from the "bondage of corruption*" (and be brought) "*into the glorious "liberty of the children of God.*" And when he would encourage those who believed in Jesus, and who were exposed to suffering and death on that account, denouncing

from the previous conduct of God towards his creatures, and especially towards those whom he had selected for his especial purpose, as instruments to bring about his great design of good to all—such as Adam, Noah, Abraham, Moses, the Jewish People, and others, recorded in the sacred scriptures—reasoning from these cases, he concludes —and "*we know*" (by this history) "*that all things work* "*together for good to those that love God, to* THOSE WHO "ARE THE CALLED ACCORDING TO HIS PURPOSE; *for* "*whom he did foreknow,*" (or fore-acknowledge in times that are past) "*he also did predestinate;*" (bind round with circumstances) "*and moreover, whom he did predestinate,* "*them he also called; and whom he called, them he also* "*justified; and whom he justified, them he also glorified.*" That is to say, those whom he foreknew, as fitted for his purpose, he so placed them—arranged, ordered, and surrounded them with circumstances—that they should, in spite of all difficulties, be fitted for and accomplish the purposes for which he had originally selected them.

This great and glorious view of the character of Deity it is which must form the clue to our inquiry as to his conduct toward our first parents; and, in every respect, we shall find that it precisely accords and corresponds therewith. This wise, this gracious Being it was that formed this beauteous world—that brought it out from a dark and desolate mass of matter, clothed it with verdure, adorned it with trees and fruits and flowers, and made it a fit habitation for the creatures he intended to form and place upon it. Well may we adopt the language of one of our early poets—

> "I love (I have some cause to love) the earth;
> She is my Maker's creature—therefore good:
> She is my mother—for she gave me birth;
> She is my tender nurse—she gives me food."

Of birds, beasts, fishes, reptiles, and every creeping thing—perfect with an unerring instinct from the first—needing no culture, improvement, or moral discipline, but amply furnished with every means necessary for enjoyment of existence, self-preservation, and the perpetuation of their species;—of these we hear no more; that we should do so was not necessary; *they* were a finished work, for *them* their creator had done all which their nature required; man alone seemed now the object of his providence; and why? because he alone, of all the creatures God had made, stood

in need of protection and instruction from his Maker. What then, judging from our present knowledge, were the nature, character, and circumstances of this being, man? Of all the animals that exist he is, in infancy, the weakest—the most defenceless and helpless—and, but for the care and assistance of others, must perish almost the instant he comes into the world. At length, delivered from "his nurse's "arms," we find the heedless being, from ignorance and inexperience, running into every folly; and, but for the effect of parental care and moral discipline—line upon line and precept upon precept—he would become the slave of every passion and darling pursuit. Without instinct to guide him, and endued with strong passions—the materials of all future excellence, but which, becoming ripe before his reason is matured, expose him to the greatest danger—we trace him then advanced to manhood; where difficulties, errors, disappointments, and vexation, form a school of experience to unfold the powers of his mind, mature his reason, and teach him to controul and regulate those passions which otherwise would be his master. Such is the creature, man—and such as he is God has made him, and placed him on this earth, and surrounded him by the circumstances in which we see him placed—yet this helpless creature, weak and feeble as we find him, is destined through his own experience, and through the experience of those who have gone before him, progressively to improve even in this the first stage of his existence, and to arrive at a state of mental and moral culture, which may fully justify the exclamation of the poet—

"What a piece of work is man! how noble in reason! how infinite in faculties! in form and moving how express and admirable! in action how like an angel! in apprehension how like a God! the beauty of the world! the paragon of animals!"

Whilst, in future stages of his existence, man seems fitted and destined to go on in interminable improvement and ever-increasing happiness.

But if this be the true nature and character of man, as we are enabled to appreciate that character in the present advanced state of society and of the human mind—What must have been the nature and character of the first of the human race? We find him formed, it is true, in the stature of a man, but helpless, ignorant, and inexperienced as a child; not corrupt, but liable to error; perfect in all, but that which could be perfected by experience and discipline

alone; and destined, through these means, to be ultimately made perfect. What then must we expect to be the conduct of *such* a Creator as we have described, towards *such* a creature so formed, and so destined? Just such, it may be replied, as in this concise history we find actually to be the case. Thus we have seen that the man was first placed in a garden, free from all that was noxious, and furnished with all that was pleasant to the eye, and good for food; and this place he is to till and cultivate. Well was such a garden suited to his then circumstances! But here he was not always to dwell; nor would it have been consistent with his happiness or destination; for

> "What is man,
> If his chief good and market of his time
> Be but to sleep and feed?—A beast, no more!
> Sure he that made us with such large discourse
> Looking before and after, gave us not
> This capability and god-like reason,
> To rust in us unused."

To have thus left man would have been wholly incompatible with his mental powers, and with his capacity for improvement and happiness. Man must have been an animal of a structure totally different from his present, if he could have long tasted felicity in a condition void of excitements to labour and exertion. Mutual wants and necessities are the bonds of society. The vicissitudes of light and darkness, summer and winter, of calms and tempests, contribute, upon the whole, to the enjoyment of life. Without some mixture of pain with pleasure the mind and body, as they are now constituted, would grow listless and languid; and, without mistakes in judgment, and errors in practice, good and evil could not be properly appreciated, principle developed, or experience obtained, so as to lead us to choose what is really preferable.

Adam was destined to be the father of mankind—of that race which was not only to cultivate the earth, but to have their reasoning powers brought to maturity by moral discipline and experience. To this grand end were all the steps and circumstances directed in this preparatory school of mental and moral discipline; and, in these first lessons, man was taught to know what things were good for food, and how to cultivate the ground; habits of industry were enjoined, and he was led to admire the beauties of his Maker's works—all necessary to form the future man, and fit him for that more enlarged sphere of action for which God had intended him. As the preservation of mere animal

life was not the only thing necessary, he being a moral and dependent creature, and, as the first of his race, deriving no advantage from the experience of others, it became necessary that he should be taught obedience to, and dependance on, his Maker. The use of one tree is, therefore, prohibited to him, whilst all the rest are freely granted to him; the highest penalty of disobedience, extinction of being, is threatened; extinction of being—the import of which, indeed, he could but imperfectly comprehend, yet which was more tangible to his senses than any other punishment with which he could have been threatened. The very prohibition would naturally create desire. Place a child in a garden, and prohibit any particular tree, and its fruit becomes infinitely more desirable than that of all the rest. The woman saw the serpent eat that fruit which she had been forbidden to taste; it was, we are informed, pleasant to the eye, and desirable to make one wise; she ate thereof, and she gave it to her husband, and he did eat also. Nothing could be more natural than this, from their inexperience; but, at the same time, nothing could more decidedly prove their weakness; few of what are now called their corrupt descendants would, at an age of maturity, fall under so weak a temptation—let us hear no more then of the previous perfection of our first parents. After they had eaten, reflection followed, and their eyes being opened, they saw the consequence of their disobedience, and were afraid. This, then, was the first necessary and most valuable moral lesson. The woman had been, like most of her posterity, led astray by appearances, and, by this event, she was taught the necessity of reflecting on all the consequences of desire* before she put it into execution. Adam, as yet unacquainted with these inevitable consequences, and influenced by feelings of affection for his wife, was induced to follow her example; and who amongst his sons can say that they would not, and have not fallen under a like temptation? By this he also learned that the man, who was to be the guide and head of the woman, ought ever to be on his guard against the allurements of a being weaker than himself—allurements essentially connected with the happiness of man if properly directed; but if not controuled by reason, experience, and sound judgment (coming from one, to please whom all his finer feelings would and ought to be called forth) must necessarily tend to the

* See James i. 12—15.

deceiving of his judgment, and lead him into danger. Both of them were further taught, by this transgression, that fear and shame must always accompany guilt; and that they were moral and accountable beings. Further to impress this grand and all-important lesson—the Deity is described as appearing, by some miraculous means, and questioning them as to what they had done; fear seizes on them, and conscious guilt makes them fly and seek to hide themselves from that blessed Being whose voice and presence, had they continued innocent, must have been their glory and delight. Here, surely, was an important lesson—thus to teach them to shun the path of guilt, though strewed with flowers, and ever after walk in the path of virtue and obedience, however thorny that path might, at the time, appear. Filled with shame, with confusion, and remorse, they make the best excuse they can. Arraigned before their now awful judge, with fear and terror they await the doom that is, in their apprehension, to consign them both, for ever, to eternal oblivion. But does this kind, this gracious Being inflict on them the full penalty of the law? Forgetful whereof they are made—that they are but dust, or, at best, children in knowledge and experience, has he placed them in circumstances, the result of which he must have foreknown, merely to ensnare and then to punish them? Are they in his power—penitent and humbled at his feet—and will he shew no mercy? Far be such a thought from our minds, blasphemous as it would be to the character of God, and inconsistent, as we know it to be, with all his attributes, and all his dispensations. Could he who has instructed his creatures not to be "*overcome of evil, but "to overcome evil with good;*" could he thus have inflicted a cruel and excessive punishment? Might not the Christian well ask—Could he who, through the religion of Jesus, has so attuned my feelings that I know not what it is to retain lasting resentment against my greatest enemy, for any length of time; but, on the contrary, make every due allowance for his circumstances, and pity him for his errors; that if he were before me, penitent and in my power, I could not but shew him mercy;—could the being who has taught *me* this, have been *himself* less merciful to the creatures he has formed? But, in the way of reply, it is said—he is God and not man. True, and for that very reason, if for no other, he will be more gracious, more merciful, more forgiving. A man may injure his fellow man, but none of our sins can injure our creator. Surely he will, as he has commanded

his servants to do, "*overcome evil with good;*" he will make all our errors moral lessons for our improvement. Nor, in this case of our first parents, are such our just expectations disappointed; for his very judgment he turns into a blessing; the penalty of death is not even mentioned, but Deity, taking occasion to apostrophize the serpent in their presence,* shews its insignificance and worthlessness, lest, from the high idea they had formed of its sagacity, they might be led into idolatry; he first, then, pronounces that enmity shall subsist between the race of man and the serpent tribe; in order, as it would appear, that when our first parents were sent out into the uncultivated world, they might always be upon their guard against injury from reptiles of this description, such being more dangerous to them than any other. On the woman the Deity pronounces as a punishment that of which she had had no experience, but which, no doubt, she would have been exposed to, whether, in this instance, she had sinned or not—pain in gestation and delivery. All other animals, having no reflection, go through this state with only the feeling of the moment; woman, as a reasonable being, "looking before and after," might, in the ordinary course of things, have regarded it as an evil and a hardship; but, viewing it as a mitigated punishment, when she had exposed herself to the highest penalty, that of death itself, she would feel not merely resigned but grateful. With Adam the same beneficent plan is pursued; the Deity, as it were, availing himself of their condemned situation, pronounces, as a punishment, that which must have formed part of his original design, and which was necessary for the well-being and improvement of mankind—that in the sweat of his brow he should eat bread *all the days of his life*, which is further explained as being *till he returned to the dust;* thus making that which would otherwise have appeared a hardship, to be regarded as an act of mercy and a blessing; for had Adam been sent out of this safe and delightful garden, Paradise, to till the uncultivated

* We say with the text, *the serpent*, for no mention is made throughout of the devil; and one strong proof that Moses never intended to convey an idea of the existence of such a being is, that he never once mentioned such a being to the Jews, throughout the whole of the Pentateuch; whereas had he believed in such a being, and had he known the dreadful evils he had occasioned in Eden, as well as that he was not only the tempter of man in his original state, but would continue to be the same to man in his fallen state, every page must have teemed with warning against the seductions of so potent an enemy, or he, Moses, would have been the most faithless of instructors.

earth without some apparent cause, the retrospection of his former state would have been a bar to all his future pleasure. Every man who has experienced it can judge how hard a task it is to resign pleasures and gratification to which we have been used, and to descend to lower circumstances; but if some rich nobleman had forfeited his life to the laws of his country, and the king were to pardon him on the single condition that by the sweat of his brow he should earn his bread, that which, under other circumstances, would have appeared the greatest evil, would then be gratefully received as a gracious boon. Thus was it, it would appear, with Adam; his life was spared—existence was a blessing yet worth having, though deprived of many which he had hitherto enjoyed; but then he knew his guilt, he knew that he had justly forfeited all—even life itself, and he gratefully blessed the gracious Being who had thus so tempered judgment with mercy. We know, besides, how necessary labour is to the health of creatures formed as we are; even those who by their property are not necessitated to labour, if they wish to enjoy health and consequent happiness, are obliged to find a substitute. How great and important a lesson did our first parent learn from this transaction! Hitherto they had only known the Deity as their Creator—as their provider and protector, and could depend on his favour only so long as they were implicitly obedient to his commands. They now learn that he is as good as he is great—merciful as he is wise and powerful; that he is, indeed, as he afterwards proclaims himself to Moses, "*the Lord God, gracious and merciful; "forgiving iniquity, transgressions, and sins, though by no "means clearing the*" (impenitent) "*guilty.*" Here, indeed, was a new—a great—a glorious source for love, for gratitude, and praise; here was the most lovely and amiable exhibition of the character of God, so suited to the condition of frail and erring creatures. Well might they have exclaimed—"*Who would not fear and reverence thy name, for thou only art "holy!*" Not only were they taught this lesson, but the ungrateful truth was also communicated and impressed upon their minds, that they were mortal—that they were made of frail materials which, from their very nature, must decay; a truth of which they could have had no practical experience, and one which, coming in any other way, or at any other time, might have appeared harsh and ungrateful to their feelings; whilst, under present circumstances, the idea that they had escaped from instant death, that their lives were yet prolonged would absorb all others, and make the

distant prospect scarce perceptible to their minds. Yet the hint once given, future experience would call it to their minds with salutary but not painful feelings. Thus prepared by every necessary means, and every kind consideration for their feelings, in this wise and gracious preparatory school, they retire from the garden of Eden, being first taught the way to procure necessary coverings suitable to their new situation and circumstances. They go forth to fulfil their original destiny, that of cultivating and peopling the earth, which "*God had created to be "inhabited;*" but lest recollection of their former blessings should lead them into fresh error, and lest, mistaking the name for the quality of the tree of life, (as it is evident they had done in consequence of its having been called also the tree of knowledge of good and evil) they should return and, by eating of the tree, seek to avert the dreaded event of dissolution, which God had told them must necessarily take place, a guard is benevolently placed to bar them from all future hope and expectation.

Thus has it been shewn that this simple history (which has, by misinterpretation and false comments, been made the foundation of the most tremendous and horrid doctrines, full of blasphemy against God and derogatory to man) is, on the contrary, full of the most pleasing and sublime ideas of the character of God—of his love and beneficence to man; that neither curse nor death to Adam, and still less to his posterity in any shape or form, is denounced in consequence of his transgression; that the whole of the conduct of Adam was consistent with his nature and circumstances, neither making him nor his descendants depraved or corrupt, the whole having been planned and designed by the Deity as a system of useful and necessary *education* for the new-formed pair; and that the whole of the conduct of God towards them was, as it ever has been and ever will be towards all his creatures—wise, beneficent, and good. That no real punishment was actually inflicted; nor would it, indeed, have been just under all the circumstances of the case. A man without experience — the first temptation and offence—a just and good parent would not punish a child for such an offence and under such circumstances.*

* Jesus has taught us thus to reason—"*If ye then, being evil, know how "to give good gifts unto your children, how much more shall your father which is "in heaven give good things to them that ask him?*"—"*Be perfect as your heavenly "father, who maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain "on the just and on the unjust.*" See also the beautiful parable of the Prodigal Son as illustrative of the character of God.

Well, then, may we (on a review of the whole) exclaim with the apostle, (Rom. xi. 33) "*O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! how unsearchable are his judgments and his ways past finding out! for who hath known the mind of the Lord, or who hath been his counsellor? or who hath first given to him and it shall be recompensed to him again? for of him, and through him, and to him are* ALL THINGS; *to whom be glory for ever, Amen.*"

Thus, every step which we have taken has exhibited such fresh—such delightful views of the wisdom and goodness of the Supreme Being, as to fill the mind with the most exquisite delight; whilst, when we contemplate the doctrines that men have pretended to deduce from this narrative—doctrines, too, which they have ventured to call christian—we may be well persuaded that all which Atheists and Deists have ever written cannot have done so much injury to the cause of Christianity, or have contained half the blasphemy as that which has been said on this subject by pretended orthodox Christians.

If the explanation which we have submitted of these three first chapters be correct, then, indeed, not only are the pillars of priestcraft and orthodoxy shaken, but the whole superstructure must fall crumbled into dust; for if man be not a fallen creature, in consequence of the sin of Adam, then all the doctrines founded upon that alleged fall, such as original sin, natural corruption, the atonement, &c. must necessarily share the same fate; and we must retire from the consideration of this whole subject with feelings of astonishment, that so much time and labour should have been employed; so many volumes written on subjects that have no foundation but in the vain imaginations of ignorant or interested men; whilst it must be with feelings of gratitude and delight, that we are thus enabled to vindicate the character of God and the sacred scriptures from such unfounded calumnies, and such horrid blasphemies, as these in question.

In support of the same doctrines, however, passages are quoted from the New Testament as well as from the Old. The writings of the apostle Paul are particularly cited with this object. We have already remarked, what every reasonable man must admit to be correct, as the apostle Paul never pretends to revelation on this subject, and must therefore have drawn his inferences from this account in Genesis, that, therefore, if any thing he had said should seem to differ from that account, we ought to be guided by the text and not by the comment. Yet, as some parts of his writings

are supposed to maintain a different view of the subject, we may, in some future Essay, if we find opportunity, take up and explain such passages, not indeed as a matter of necessity, but as one rather of curiosity, and to satisfy the minds of the weak and fastidious; feeling no doubt but that the passages will, when fairly examined and properly explained, be found all to correspond with the original account of the creation and early history of man, as recorded in the book of Genesis, and prove that Paul understood this narrative in the same light that we have done.

THE RESURRECTION FROM THE DEAD OPPOSED TO THE DOCTRINE OF THE IMMORTALITY OF THE SOUL.

ESSAY VI.—INTERMEDIATE STATE.

"As to the consequences of the present question, it appears, that, on the one side, (that of materialism) there is nothing more than a temporary cessation of thought, which can hurt nobody, except the self-interested papist, or the self-sufficient Deist, whose high claim to an inherent principle of immortality, is shown to be vain and groundless; but on the other side, (that of immaterialism) there is a manifest derogation *from*, if not a total subversion *of*, that positive covenant, which professes to entitle us to everlasting life; all proper and consistent notions of death, resurrection and a future judgment are confounded; in fine, all the great sanctions of the gospel are rendered unintelligible or useless."—*Bishop Law's Theory of Religion, Postscript*, 437, 438, &c.

An INTERMEDIATE STATE *of conscious and active existence*, which is said to be entered upon immediately at our death, and to continue until the resurrection, will form the subject to be examined in the present paper; and, before we enter upon the arguments by which this doctrine is advocated, we would premise, that the scriptures are most clear and distinct in what they communicate relative to man's future condition, uniformly setting forth that that state is to *commence* at the resurrection—that we shall not live again till the resurrection—that mankind will not be judged before the resurrection—that the faith, labours, and suffering of believers are unprofitable and perish if there be no resurrection.* Such being, unequivocally, the doctrines of the scriptures; the supporters of immateri-

---

* See Law's Theory, Appendix.

them, have naturally felt them to be incompatible with their hypothesis; for if an immortal soul be an essential part of man, such soul being, in its own nature, indestructible, then, of necessity, future existence *does* commence *before* the resurrection, and the faith, labours, and sufferings of believers do not, nor can they perish even if a resurrection never takes place: thus situated in regard to doctrines so opposed as those of immaterialism, and a resurrection from the dead, their supporters have had recourse to heathen sources, and from thence, and not from the scriptures, have deduced an hypothesis, which is thus described—"In the interval between death and the resurrection, there "is an intermediate state, in which the departed souls of "the good are supposed to have an inperfect reward, and "the souls of the wicked an imperfect punishment:"*—and while we in vain look to the scriptures for a description of this "*interval* between death and the resurrection," we readily discover its origin among the comparatively consistent immaterialists of the heathen nations, whom we have shewn, in our former Essays, believed souls to be an emanation of that intellectual fire by which the universe is animated; and that when they are released from the body they returned to God; but that, previously to such return, they have "an interval," by being placed in an "*intermediate state*," for the purpose of being purified from the consequences of their late pollution. So early as the second century, Origin, and other "Fathers," incorporated this system with the Christian doctrine of future existence, and from thence the catholic "Purgatory" was immediately derived; so that this essential branch of the doctine of immaterialism became one of great influence and profit to the Romish Church, into which it was introduced by Gregory in the sixth century, being honoured with an infallible affirmation in the year 1140, and so continued till the Reformation, when most of the reformers being content with a small degree of refinement upon Catholicism merely prohibited prayers for the souls of the deceased. To such general belief in the truth of immaterialism Luther, in the earlier part of his life, was a singular exception. In his defence, (published 1520) which was condemned by Leo X, he states, "I permit the Pope to make "articles of faith for himself and his faithful, such as

* Rees's Cyclopædia, vol. 33.—"Sleep of the Soul."

"that he is Emperor of the world, King of heaven, and "God upon earth—that the *soul is immortal*, with all "those monstrous opinions to be found in the Roman "dunghill of decretals."* On the latter point, however, Luther seems to have stood nearly alone: neither does it appear that he evinced much perseverance in its defence, opposed as it was to the decrees of the church of Rome, on the one hand, and to the prejudices of his brother reformers on the other; and, indeed, the latter announced that, "Faith "requires that we should think, that the dead are not "nothing, but that they truly live before God; the pious "happily in Christ, the wicked in an horrible expectation "of the revelation of divine judgment."† But it will be found that anything rather than uniformity of opinion, as to the condition of souls in this "intermediate state," has prevailed and does prevail among its supporters; and that while the decree above quoted apportions to the wicked—"an hor-"rible expectation of the revelation of divine judgment"—Calvin is content to deal only with the souls of "the faithful;" for "it is nothing to me," he observes, "what becomes of *their* "*souls*," (the wicked) "I will only be responsible for the faith-"ful," in an intermediate state‡; the more modern defenders of the doctrine abound also with contentions with each other; first, as to the place and condition of all souls, whether virtuous or vicious; secondly, as to the union of the same soul with the same body at the resurrection; and thirdly, as to those passages of scripture which expressly reserve all hopes of future life, of punishment, and of reward, until the resurrection—out of these difficulties and contentions, have arisen a sect of semi-immaterialists, who, while they succeed in proving that neither reward nor punishment can take place *until* the resurrection, yet they most inconsistently contend that man is animated by a soul; and, for the purpose of reconciling all parties and every inconsistency, they assert that this quality of man, immortal and self-existent as it is, becomes, at the dissolution of the body, partially non-existent, being until the resurrection in a state of sleep, or insensibility. To this absurd position Bishop Warburton, who, it will be seen, was at least *consistent* in his immaterialism, makes a reply possessed of much force. "Their sleep of the soul is mere cant; and

* Luther's Defence, Proposition XXVIIth.
† Harmon. Conf. p. 14, 1 Mea Portis.
‡ Psychopan. fol. 50. Edit. 1545.

"this brings me to consider the sense and consistency "of so ridiculous a notion. Now sleep is a modification "of existence, not of non-existence, so that the sleep of "*a substance* hath a meaning—the sleep of *a quality* is "nonsense."* We have thought it well thus to refer to the contradictory theories of our opponents, and that for two reasons; first, because in fairness they might claim to be represented in their own words; and secondly, because it is the best mode of aiding our object; as we feel confident of successfully effecting in the present what we have already done in the previous department of our inquiry; namely, proving not merely a want of scriptural evidence in *support* of immaterialism, but that the doctrines of the scriptures are in unequivocal opposition to it in all its parts. With this strong conviction upon our minds, produced by a careful attention to the arguments on both sides of the question, we shall proceed at once to an examination of such passages in the scriptures as are deemed either directly or inferentially to support the doctrine of an intermediate state; premising, that if the immortality of the soul be true, there is and must be a state of conscious existence, and that enjoyed too by all indiscriminately, prior to the "*judgment of the great day*" —and also, that if there be such a state, it is of the first importance that the fact should have been distinctly communicated; for, if the doctrine be scriptural, we are entitled to ask for the law and the testimony, and in fairness to require that the passages shall be as clear and as decided, because equally required to be so (and from being an essential part of the doctrine of futurity, they would and must be so), as the declarations of Jesus and his apostles relative to a resurrection from the dead and future judgment: as a proof of the entire want of such evidence, we have upon record a candid, but certainly a very extraordinary confession of one of the ablest defenders of this doctrine, in which, so conscious is the writer of the want of scripture authority, that he is compelled to admit, that "the intermediate state "between death and the resurrection is a subject upon "which the scriptures *have not said so much as one could* "*wish*†." From such an admission, then, and from such an authority too in this controversy, it will be allowed, that, in fairness of argument, the discussion might, as it regards the

* Bishop Warburton's Strictures on the Doctrine of the Sleep of the Soul.

† Dr. Jortin's Sermons.

scriptural evidence nearly terminate; but that there are other defenders of the same doctrine, who while their arguments prove that they are not in a better condition than the reverend author above quoted, yet seem to have either more faith or less ingenuousness than he possessed; and who contend, that there are "many expressions "of scripture, in the natural and obvious sense, which "imply that an intermediate and separate state is ac-"tually to succeed death."* With such materials before us, therefore, we purpose examining not merely the "expressions" which are assumed to "imply" such a state, but also the strong cases which it is contended, directly and unequivocally reveal such a state. To the latter class of arguments we shall first direct our attention, and it will be found to embrace several difficult portions of the scriptures, and among the number, the one which is the most confidently relied upon by our opponents shall take the precedence. On account of its assumed importance to their theory, as well as to give effect to the subjoined refutation, we shall quote the whole of the parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus, as recorded by Luke, who thus represents Jesus as addressing his disciples as well as the Scribes and Pharisees:—"*There was a certain "rich man which was clothed in purple and fine linen, and fared "sumptuously every day: and there was a certain beggar, named "Lazarus, which was laid at his gate full of sores, and desiring "to be fed with the crumbs which fell from the rich man's table: "the beggar died, and was carried by angels into Abraham's "bosom: the rich man also died and was buried. And in hell he "lifted up his eyes, being in torments, and seeth Abraham afar "off, and Lazarus in his bosom; and he said, Father Abraham, "have mercy on me, and send Lazarus that he may dip the tip "of his finger in water and cool my tongue, for I am tormented "in this flame. But Abraham said, Son, remember that thou in "thy life-time receivedst thy good things, and likewise Lazarus "evil things; but now he is comforted, and thou art tormented; "and beside all this, between us and you there is a great gulph "fixed, so that they which would pass from hence to you can-"not; neither can they pass to us that would come from "thence.*" (Luke xvi.) Here we have to remark that this parable can admit of but one of two modes of interpretation—either figurative or literal; if the former, then the connexion in which it occurs; the circumstances which gave rise to it;

* Dr. Campbell's Preliminary Dissertations, Part 2.

the definite object for which it was delivered; and the admitted character of allegorical instruction, are all essential to its being correctly understood: if the latter, then every circumstance enumerated must be taken *literally* as they are related: and, indeed, so necessary do some of the defenders of an intermediate state esteem a literal interpretation, that, in an answer to Priestley published in 1778, we are apprised that "we should never presume to stray from the express, "obvious, literal meaning." Bound then by such conditions, we look at this parable, and bear in our minds, that the soul of man is described by its advocates to be spiritual —not visible to the sight, and that it takes its flight, immediately upon the dissolution of the body, to inhabit a state which is thus described by an author before referred to: that "whilst the good enter into a state of peace and com-"fort, the wicked are properly condemned to an *insensible* "*condition* till the last day calls them forth."* *Literally*, then, it appears, that Lazarus, not an immortal soul, but that the "*beggar*" Lazarus, "*full of sores*," was immediately upon his death, carried by angels and deposited in the bosom of Abraham—that the rich man at his death was placed not in an "intermediate state;" not in Dr. Jortin's "insensible condition till the last day;" but was in hell "*tormented in flame*"—that the receptacle for the virtuous is so immediately in the neighbourhood of that for the wicked, that the parties can *see* each other, that they can hold familiar conversation together—that Abraham, though on the other "*side of the gulph*," and in heaven, is still the "Father" of the wicked in hell; and that the aforesaid wicked are acknowledged by Abraham to be his *Sons;* and that, finally, if it be contended, that it was the immortal soul of Lazarus that was in Abraham's bosom, and the immortal soul of the rich man that required a drop of water to cool its immortal tongue, then *immaterial* spirits can be burned by *material* fire; and though not visible to the sight, nor tangible to the touch, could go to the rich man's "*fa-*"*ther's house*," to his five brethren, and could "*testify unto* "*them*," lest they also came to the like place of torment.—This, we submit, to take it *literally*, is the fair interpretation of this parable, teaching, as it is said to do, "the *immediate* "transition of the soul into one or other of these two dif-"ferent states, which is observable in the narration or

* Dr. Jortin's Sermons.

"parable itself, from their death to their succeeding state "of happiness or misery."* And we might, perhaps, leave to our adversaries the solution of their own difficulties, and the reconciling of such direct contradictions in their system, as flow from applying this parable to the support of the doctrine of an intermediate state of existence. One, indeed, among their number, has felt it judicious not to hazard too large a portion of his faith upon the present parable, and admits, that it is "NOT A REPRESENTATION OF AN INTER-"MEDIATE STATE, but of the final state of the righteous "and the wicked."† This admission of the reverend immaterialist is, we contend, completely and to the fullest extent, giving up the point in debate: but still, we shall proceed to shew, that it is not even a representation of "the final state "of the righteous and the wicked," much less that for which Macknight puts in his claim, "that it teaches us that the "souls of men are immortal; that they subsist in a separate "state after the dissolution of the body; and that they" (in such state, we presume) "are rewarded or punished, according to their actions in this life."‡ With this object we look to the preceding chapter, and from thence learn, that the "*pharisees and scribes murmured*" at the teaching of Jesus; and that he "*spake parables unto them.*" This teaching by parables being "that kind of allegory which consists of a continued "narration of a fictitious event, applied by way of simile to "the illustration of some important truth."‖ The objects of Jesus in the several parables in the present connexion would appear to be, to shew that his attention to "*publicans* "*and sinners*" was agreeable to the will of God; to expose the self-righteous Jews, who "*justified themselves before men:*" to correct avaricious dispositions—"*for the pharisees, who* "*were covetous, heard all these things, and they derided him:*" and wisely and by gradual steps to exhibit to his disciples and others, the true character of God, and develope a knowledge of the divine dispensations in fulfilling the covenant with Abraham, by the calling in of the Gentiles. To these objects, the present parable, and that of the Prodigal Son, with which it is connected, are especially directed:—in the latter, the eldest son; in the former, the "*certain rich man,* "*clothed in purple and fine linen,*" are the representatives of

* Bulkely's Discourses on the Parables of the New Testament.
† Bishop Warburton. ‡ Macknight, vol. ii. p. 294.
‖ Bishop Lowth's Lectures on the Sacred Poetry of the Hebrews.

the proud and privileged Jew; exactly those characters, some of whom were then near Jesus, and who, though "*highly es-* "*teemed among men, were an abomination in the sight of God:*" —in the one case, the outcast son; in the other, the despised beggar, are the representatives of the gentiles, hitherto excluded from the kingdom of God. But "*the law and the pro-* "*phets were until John; since that time the kingdom of God is* "*preached, and every man presseth into it.*" (Verse 16.) The kingdom being, since the time of John, thrown open to the Gentiles as well as to the Jews, such as entered into it were carried by angels*—by messengers—such messengers being Jesus and his apostles—into Abraham's bosom—into the kingdom of God; that kingdom or church which originated with Abraham, and the enlargement of which at the time of Jesus being misunderstood by the Jews, they in their turn became the outcasts. They *had* received their "*good things,*" and the Gentiles their "*evil ones*;" but now they were comforted, and the Jews were tormented; because they would not hear Moses and the prophets: neither were they persuaded when one *did* rise from the dead. This interpretation, we submit, is not a strained one, but a fair and rational explanation of the parable we have been examining; and one which, while it makes it harmonize with the connexion in which it occurs, and to be suitable to the circumstances under which, and the parties to whom, it was delivered, must shew, on the one hand, the gross absurdity of attempting to make it teach popish and heathen doctrines; and on the other, the pitiable condition in which a correct knowledge of the scriptures must ever place the defenders of immaterialism.

THE ANGELS WHICH KEPT NOT THEIR FIRST ESTATE, spoken of in Jude, we notice merely because it has been adduced in this controversy; though, as being evidently unconnected with it, that notice will be necessarily brief. "*And* "*the angels which kept not their first estate, but left their own ha-* "*bitation, he hath reserved in everlasting chains, under darkness* "*unto the judgment of the great day.*" (Verse 6.) We submit, that whatever opinions the phraseology of this passage may

* "The word *angel*, is not properly a denomination of nature, but of office; denoting as much as *nuncius*, *messenger*, a person employed to carry one's orders, or to declare his will."—*Rees's Cyclopædia, Angel.* "The Greek word we render angel, does, in its primitive sense, signify nothing more than messengers; and, accordingly, in James ii. 25, it is the same Greek word that is rendered angels in other passages that is there rendered *messengers*."—See *Goadby*, vol. iv. p. 910.

have given rise to, that of authorizing the doctrine of an intermediate state for the souls of men, it is not chargeable with; for it speaks *not* of men, *not* of souls, *not* of a state of darkness for the souls of men; nor does it give the slightest countenance to Bishop Bull's general theory, that "the "souls of all the wicked are presently after death in a state "of very great misery, and yet dreading a far greater mi-"sery at the day of judgment."*

From this passage we proceed to one in Peter, where mention is made of Christ as PREACHING TO THE SPIRITS IN PRISON.—"*By which also, he*" (Jesus) "*went and preached* "*to the spirits in prison, which sometime were disobedient:* "*when once the long-suffering of God waited in the days of* "*Noah, while the ark was preparing, wherein few, that is eight* "*souls, were saved by water.*" (1 Peter iii. 19, 20.) From these verses it has been contended, that the apostle assumes an intermediate state of conscious existence: but in attending to this passage we have to remind our readers, that as it regards the term "spirits," we have already amply proved (see vol i. p. 370) that it has not only various significations, but that in a connexion like the present, the translator should most unequivocally have placed in its stead either the term "persons," or "minds," and then the true meaning of the apostle could not well have been controverted. We shall now proceed to the examination of the passage, by continuing the same principles of inquiry which we have previously adopted—that of looking at the connexion, and the general scope and object of the writer: from whence we feel confident of proving, that it gives no support to the doctrine of immaterial spirits, and that it has no reference to an intermediate, or indeed, to any state of *future* existence. Peter commences his letter by addressing it to the believers "*scattered abroad;*" exhorting them to withstand persecution, such being "*the trial of their faith;*" (which faith was "*more precious than that of gold, which perisheth,*") and as

* A correct understanding of this passage will shew, that besides being wholly irrelevant to the doctrine of an intermediate state, it is equally free from sanctioning another most absurd hypothesis, in support of which it is universally brought—that of FALLEN ANGELS. The parties referred to by Jude, being the messengers (as recorded in Numbers xiv.) who were sent to spy out the land, and who for bringing up a "*false report*" lost their "*first* "*estate,*" or the pre-eminence which as "*rulers*" they had possessed. For a full and convincing support of these ideas, consult Bekker, and also Goadby's Bible, vol. iv. 910, &c.; and for passages illustrative of the peculiar phraseology of the verse, see Job x. 21, &c., and Acts iii. 24.

an example to them, the sufferings of Jesus are referred to, "*that he might bring us to God, being put to death in the flesh;* "*but quickened by the spirit;*" that is, raised from the dead by the spirit of God—"*by the power of God.*"* The same idea we find expressed by Paul, though in somewhat different language: "*though he was crucified, yet he liveth by* "*the power of God:*" (2 Cor. xiii. 4.) by which (power or authority) "*he went and preached unto the spirits*" (PERSONS) "*in prison;*" or in other language, to those whose "MINDS" were imprisoned; being in that state of darkness, which in the succeeding chapter is represented as one of death: "*for* "*the gospel was preached also to them that are dead;*" (1 Peter, iv. 1, &c.) that is, "*dead in trespasses and sins.*" And thus, such persons—spirits—being morally and mentally in prison, to them Jesus, by preaching and proclaiming the gospel, broke their fetters, and released them from prison, in the sense in which moral delivery is spoken of in Isaiah.—"*The spirit of* "*the Lord is upon me, to proclaim liberty to the captives, and* "*the opening of the prison to them that are bound.*" (Isa. lxi. 1.) So that an attention to the connexion becomes essential, as also a correct understanding of the phraseology peculiar to the scriptures. This will be more fully seen in Isaiah's prophecy of the mission of him who, in Peter's language, PREACHED TO THE SPIRITS IN PRISON.—"*I, the Lord, have* "*called thee, and give thee for a covenant of the people, for a* "*light of the gentiles, to open the blind eyes, to bring out the* "*prisoners from the prison, and them that sit in darkness out of* "*the prison-house.*" (Isa. xlii. 6, &c.) Looking, therefore, at the phraseology of corresponding passages as to what state they were in, and who the spirits were to whom Jesus "*preached,*" this passage ceases to be of difficult solution: but had not Isaiah thus furnished an easy illustration, the connexion of the apostle's argument in the after verses would have effected that object; the intention of the writer being to draw a parallel between those persons in a state of mental darkness, in the days of Noah, and in the apostolic age; which intention would have been rendered more obvious if our translators had introduced a single supplemental word, as they have so frequently done in other instances, to express the sense of the original: the passage would then have stood thus—"*By which he went and preached to the spirits in prison,* "*which sometime*"—or, as the original imports, in *former time*

* See Goadby's Bible, vol. iv. p. 863; marginal reading of Barker's Bible and Wynne's Testament, vol ii. p. 437.

—"*were disobedient; AS when once the long-suffering of God* "*waited in the days of Noah,*" &c. And, to complete his parallel, it will be seen the apostle proceeds to shew that the *ark* was then the means of saving the believers of the antedeluvian world, as *baptism*, or a public acknowledgment of the messiahship of Jesus, was the means of saving the believers in the Jewish world. Such then clearly being the scriptural import of "*PREACHING TO THE SPIRITS IN PRISON,*" we submit, that the hypothesis relative to immaterial spirits, and their residence in an intermediate state, has most distinctly, in this connexion, no countenance; and while we differ with Law, Priestley, and others, in some particulars upon this passage, that difference affords no aid to our opponents; for although these writers apply it to the gentiles only, our application of it to both Jews and gentiles, to all in fact whose minds were "*in prison,*" is only a more extensive use of the same principles of argument; and should an exception be taken to these views from the fact, that Jesus did *not* preach to the gentiles, we should reply, that his authorizing the apostles to do so will be seen, in scriptural language, to be the same thing—thus Paul, in his letter to the Ephesians, "*for he*" (Jesus) "*is our peace, who hath* "*made both one; and came and preached peace TO YOU*" (gentiles) "*WHICH WERE AFAR OFF, and to them that were nigh.*" (Ephes. ii. 17, &c.)

The "*SPIRITS OF JUST MEN MADE PERFECT,*" (Heb. xii. 23) and "*THE SOULS OF THEM THAT WERE SLAIN for* "*the word of God,*" (Rev. vi. 9) are the passages which next claim our attention. Commencing with the former, we shall first state the value of the passage in the estimation of our opponents; that it "signifies the best state to "which an unembodied spirit can come;" but that after the day of judgment, spirits will then be embodied; that "as soon as good Christians depart out of this life, they "will join the company of them"—(unembodied spirits.) The passage, however, will be seen to fail as completely in proving the point for which it is adduced, as those upon which we previously have been remarking; for it relates to believers in the present state of existence only, and to the distinguished honours and privileges to which they are called, and has no reference to immaterial spirits, or to a state prior to the resurrection, in which such spirits will be "*made perfect.*" It will be found that the writer, in figurative and bold language, exhorts those whom he addresses "*to follow peace with all men, without which no man shall see* "*the Lord; looking diligently lest any man fail of the grace*

"*of God; for you are come to the general assembly and church* "*of the first-born,*" (i.e. the Christian church); "*to God, the* "*judge of all—to the spirits of just men made perfect, and to* "*Jesus, the mediator of the new covenant.*" (Heb. xii. 15, 23, &c.) In a corrected translation, however, of this passage, it reads thus: "*Ye are come to the general assembly and con-* "*gregation of the first-born, and to God, the judge of all, and* "*to just men made perfect.*"* But if this translation be questioned, and the word "*spirits*" still retained, we should contend, from what has been clearly shewn to be the meaning of that term, that there is not any thing in the passage expressive of immaterial existence, distinct and separate from the entire living man, in the present life. Mr. Belsham, however, defends his omission of "*spirits,*" both by a reference to the original, and the use of the term in parallel passages; from which he contends, "The spirit of man, is a man him-"self; the spirit of God, is God himself;" (see 1 Cor. ii. 11) "the spirit of Timothy, is Timothy himself:" (see 2 Tim. iv. 22) "the spirits of just men, therefore, are just men "themselves. By this interpretation the author appears "to be intelligible and consistent; but if by '*the spirits* "'*of just men made perfect,*' we understand separate "souls in an intermediate state, the observation is not "only irrelevant, but it is not true; for in what sense "can believers in Christ be said to be *now* introduced "into the society of spirits in heaven? or what privilege "have they in this respect above good men under the "law?"† And the perfection here spoken of is clearly that which as members of the "assembly of the first-born," they ought to attain to, because of the superior privileges the gospel confers upon them, and can have no reference, as Dr. Priestley has observed in his notes on this passage, to any conditon of good men, or of spirits, in a future world.

In the Revelations, the passage in which the writer states, "*I saw under the altar the souls of them that were slain for* "*the word of God, and for the testimony which they held,*" (Rev. vi. 9) though adduced by our opponents with much confidence, has not what perhaps might be conceded to some of the preceding passages, even the semblance of an argument in their favour; for, as we have previously proved relative to the word soul, it is clear that in the present instance it should have been rendered by the term "lives;"

* The Epistles of Paul the Apostle, by Thomas Belsham, vol. iv. p. 701. Hunter, 1822.

† Ibid.

then, in that case, the representation of such being under the altar, will be seen to be perfectly appropriate; forming, as the verse does, part of a most highly figurative representation of the opening of the six seals; in which the stars from heaven are said to be falling, and the mountains and islands moving out of their places; and the particular allusion in the sixth verse, appears to be borrowed from the practice at the altar of victims in the temple; at the foot of which altar the *blood (the life—the soul)* was poured out, which blood, being in the sight of the sanctuary, it was supposed that it apprized God of the sacrifice that had been offered to him, and that he saw it; thus the lives of those who had sacrificed themselves in the cause of revelation, are here in bold and figurative language, described as being under the altar, in the sight of God.

From these passages we turn to one which chronologically ought to have preceded them, but because of its minor importance in our view of the argument, we have reserved it to the last—it is that of SAUL AND THE WITCH OF ENDOR, (1 Sam. xxviii.) which some of our opponents deem to prove both the existence of immortal souls, and also an intermediate state for their reception:—thus Causin, as quoted by Coward, contends that the return of souls, as in the case of the prophet Samuel, is appointed by God to prove their immortality. A modern writer also, of some celebrity, asserts that "we have one remarkable instance of a *phantom*, or appearance, in the form of Samuel the prophet; and it is not improbable that it was the departed spirit of Samuel himself, appearing, not by the incantation of the witch, but by the will of God, to denounce his awful vengeance against Israel."* Patrick, on this chapter, maintains that it was an evil spirit in the likeness of Samuel that appeared before Saul;† and others have supposed that the appearance of Samuel to Saul, was a divine miracle.‡ In forming a judgment of this case, apart from the uses to which it has been applied, it may be well to glance at the characters who are represented as acting in it:—first, The king of Israel, who upon disobeying the commands of Deity, was told, that "*the Lord had rejected him from being king over Israel,*" and who in all his subsequent engagements with the enemies of Israel, was defeated by them; the cause too of such defeats was known by the whole people

* The Case of Saul, by Granville Sharpe, p. 155—157.
† See Patrick on 1 Sam. xxviii. 12.
‡ See Dr. Waterland's Sermons, vol. ii. p. 267.

to be, that the God of Israel had rejected him to reign over them; in consequence of which he was oppressed with melancholy: (or, in Old Testament language, "*an evil spirit* "*came upon him;*") and "*when he saw the host of the Philis-* "*tines, he was afraid, and his heart greatly troubled him; and* "*he inquired of the Lord, and the Lord answered him not. Then* "*said Saul unto his servants, Seek me a woman that hath a fa-* "*miliar spirit, that I may inquire of her.*" The second personage in this representation, is the woman so selected; one, whose occupation agreed with the necromancers of the heathen nations, "who summoned the spirits of the dead to ap- "pear before them; and who carried on their trade in sub- "terranean caverns, which were well calculated to ensure "successful imposition."* But the God of Israel had prohibited the exercise of such arts; commanding his people, that "*When thou art come into the land which the Lord thy God* "*giveth thee, there shall not be one who maketh his son nor his* "*daughter to pass through the fire, or that useth divination, or an* "*observance of times; or an enchanter, or a witch, or a charmer,* "*or a consulter with familiar spirits, or a wizard, or a necro-* "*mancer; for all that do these things are an abomination to the* "*Lord, and* BECAUSE OF THESE ABOMINATIONS, *the Lord* "*thy God doth drive them out from before thee.*" (Deut. xix.) The third character, assumes to be that of Samuel, whom "*all Israel, from Dan even to Bersheba, knew to be a* "*prophet of the Lord,*" and who, when he "*died, all the* "*Israelites were gathered together, and lamented him, and* "*buried him in his house at Ramah.*" With these facts before us, we come to the chapter under examination, in which the defenders of immaterialism would fain make God to sanction that which he had solemnly denounced, as an abomination in his sight; which is supposed to confer upon one whom he had commanded to be "*cast out* "*of the land,*" the power to raise from the dead even a prophet of God, and through whose instrumentality, although Jehovah would not answer Saul, "*neither by dreams, nor by* "*urim, nor by prophets,*" yet he is made to answer him by the power of one that had "*a familiar spirit:*" for it is in vain for Mr. Granville Sharpe to attempt to get over this difficulty by asserting, that the communication was not made "by the incantations of the witch, but by some respectable "agent of the divine will,"—the text being, "*Then said the* "*woman*" (to Saul) "*Whom shall* I *bring up unto thee? and*

* See Micheales's Commentaries on the Laws of Moses, vol. iv. p. 83—92. 8vo, edit. 1814.

"*he said, Bring me up Samuel: and when the woman saw* "*Samuel,* SHE CRIED *with a loud voice,*" &c. (verses 11 and 12.) So that we may well leave to the doctrine of our opponents whatever benefit the immaterial system can derive from such serious imputations, which their hypothesis casts upon the divine government; and we would beside put it to these parties, how immaterialism can be reconciled with the present relation, and how that which is spiritual and not visible to the sight, can be *seen* to be "an old man covered with a "mantle;" but the whole case is clearly one of imposition dextrously practiced upon the weak, desponding, and superstitious mind of Saul, and that effected clearly by the practice of the art of ventriloquy—an art, of which not only the effects, but the causes which produce them are now so well understood. "The term '*ventriloqous*' is compounded "of *ventor*, belly, and *loquor*, to speak; and is applied to per-"sons who speak inwardly, so that the voice proceeding out "of the thorax seems to come from some distance, and in "any direction," (see Rees's Cyclopædia—in which is quoted the work of M. de la Chapelle, published in 1772, entitled "Le Ventriloque;" who shews, that in the case of Saul, the speech *supposed* to be addressed to him by Samuel, proceeded from the mouth of the sorceress of Endor, and that the ancient oracles derived their influence from the exercise of this art;) and upon looking at the whole of this case we cannot better express our views than in the following brief summary*:—Firstly, that the whole was a mere juggle; Secondly, that the Hebrew of the "*familiar spirit*" which the witch had, is "ob," and the plural "oboth;" and such persons were afterwards denominated "*Pythonesses*," which implies a pretence to divination; accordingly, in the vulgate version of 1 Sam. xxviii. 7, 8, the word used is "Python;" Thirdly, that the witch must have necessarily known Saul, who "*from his head and shoulders was taller* "*than any man*," in Israel; and Fourthly, that Saul throughout the whole performance did not of himself *see* Samuel; the relation being—"*When* THE WOMAN *saw Samuel,* SHE "*cried with a loud voice*," &c. (verse 12) and Saul said to her "WHAT SAWEST THOU;" (verse 13) "*and he said* "*unto her, What form is he of?*" (verse 14) and, in the same verse, when she had answered the foregoing question, Saul

* In support of which see Second Thoughts, p. 209, &c.; and also Rees's Cyclopædia, articles Ventriloquy and The Witch of Endor; and Micheales, as referred to in the preceding note.

"*perceived,*" or acknowledged from the representation of the witch, that it was Samuel. So that the deception upon Saul completely succeeded; and he "*stooped with his face "to the ground, and bowed himself.*" And it is especially deserving of remark, that the whole of the after relation made to Saul, while thus prostrate before the sorceress, consists in a repetition of what had been *long previously announced concerning his rejection by God, and of the triumph of the Philistines over him,* and which was known to the Jewish people at large. And the whole case is clearly one of dexterous imposition; and, consequently, not ill-suited to support the immaterial and intermediate doctrines by the enlightened aid of necromancy and juggling.*

We have now but very briefly to notice those expressions of scripture which, in the view of our opponents, "*imply* an intermediate state. The first and chief of such expressions being the scriptural use of the term "sleep;" which is thus argued—"Death you say is sleep; What is sleep? is the mind, during "this torpor of the body utterly and always void of thought? "Death, if it reduces the mind to a total insensibility, must "be something more than sleep; for in sleep there is often a "strong consciousness at least, if not a kind of separate "existence."† And it is contended that "to sleep," or "to "sleep with their fathers," is only "a state of inaction, or "kind of insensibility, during which we still exist." ‡ To which *we* reply that we do *not* say sleep *is* death, but that, in the scriptures, as in other writings, it is often used in a figurative sense, to express death; in proof of which, we are quite

* That favourite text in this controversy, "*This day thou shalt be with me "in paradise,*" will be found amply explained in the article entitled Death-bed Repentance, vol. ii. p. 40, of this work;—the 27th chapter of Matthew, also, verses 52 and 53, which states, that the graves were opened, and the saints arose and went into the holy city, after the crucifixion of Jesus, is clearly an interpolation; for as to who those "saints" were; for what object they arose; to whom they went; by whom they were seen; what they communicated; or what afterwards became of them—these are all points upon which there is not the slightest information; besides which, the statement occurs in one historian only; an omission on the part of the others, which had it related to some trifling circumstance, would not have required particular remark, but which in so extraordinary an occurrence as this is supposed to be, cannot consistent with truth, easily be accounted for: besides which, we would observe, that taking the verse as it stands, it is not the *souls* of the saints in an active state of existence, but "*many* BODIES *of the saints which* SLEPT *arose.*"

† Steffe's Letters on Scripture Proofs of a Separate Intermediate State of Existence after Death, p. 37, 38, &c.

‡ Essay on the Immateriality of the Soul, in reply to Dr. Priestley, p. 40, 41, &c.

willing to rest upon two of the cases that are brought to prove an opposite hypothesis: first, that of Stephen; of whom, when he was put to death, it is said he "*fell asleep;*" and, secondly, that of Lazarus, when raised from the dead by Jesus, who thus addressses his disciples—" *Our friend Lazarus sleepeth; but* " *I go that I may awake him out of his sleep; then said his dis-* " *ciples, if he sleep he shall do well;* HOWBEIT, JESUS SPAKE OF " HIS DEATH; *but they thought that he had spoken of taking rest* " *in sleep: then said Jesus unto them plainly,* Lazarus IS DEAD." (John vii.) So that the play upon the word "sleep" will not avail the argument of our opponents; for, most clearly in the passages in debate, "death" is *not* merely something more than the word "sleep," but the latter is figuratively used to express the former; and the apostle Paul sets this matter completely at rest in his argument to prove the resurrection; (which will be entered into at large in our next number) in which there is no evidence to countenance an immediate entrance upon futurity at the moment of death; in which there is no hint given of an intermediate state; but, in which, the fact of the resurrection of Jesus being admitted, then the reasoning is—not that their *was*, not that there *is* at death, but that there *will be* a future life, which is made to rest solely on the resurrection from the dead; if there be no resurrection "*then they also* THAT ARE FALLEN ASLEEP" (i. e. that are dead—that are non-existent) "IN CHRIST ARE " PERISHED." (1 Cor. xv. 8.)

It will also be found that the state of death besides, being represented in the scriptures by the idea of sleep, is also said to place man in that condition in which he is at rest; that it is a "resting place," a house, a state of "silence," of oblivion, of destruction and corruption; * and thus the following passages have fairly no difficulty or equivocation attached to them—" *Thou shalt go to thy fathers in peace;*" (Gen. xv. 15) " *Going to the grave mourning;*" (Gen. xxxvii. 35) " *Going down to the pit;*" (Isaiah xxxviii. 18) and numerous parallel passages; the whole of which, however, will be found to be simply and easily explained by the following instances in which the same expressions are used and for the same object:—thus Bathsheba addresses David for the purpose of getting his appointment, in the event of his own death, of her son Solomon to reign over Israel; " *otherwise, it shall come to pass, when he shall* SLEEP WITH

* See Bishop Law's Theory, p. 388, &c.

"*HIS FATHERS, that I and my son Solomon shall be counted* "*offenders.*" (1 Kings i. 20, 21.) And, in the following chapter, the death of David is recorded in corresponding terms—"*So David slept with his fathers, and was buried in* "*the city of David.*" (ii. 10.) Again in Job—"*As the waters* "*fail from the sea, and the flood decayeth and drieth up, so* "*man lieth down and RISETH NOT; till the heavens be no* "*more, they shall not awake, nor be RAISED OUT OF THEIR* "*SLEEP.*" (Job xiv. 10 11.)

Having now gone through, in the first place, every case which has been, or, we believe, can be, advanced by our various opponents, in support of their theory; and, in the second, having examined the "many expressions that *imply* "an intermediate and separate state," we are placed in a condition to estimate the grounds of Dr. Jortin's confession, that of such a state "the scriptures have not said so much as one could wish;" though, in truth, the Doctor ought to have acknowledged that the scriptures say not any thing of such a state, that the futurity which *they* promise is not one which we commence upon immediately at the dissolution of the body and by virtue of a never-dying principle within us; but is one far removed from that period: "*When all that* "*are in their graves*" (not in an intermediate state) "*shall* "*hear the voice of the son of man, and shall come forth; they* "*that have done good unto the resurrection of life, and they* "*that have done evil unto the resurrection of condemnation.*" (John v. 28, &c.)

THE FREETHINKING CHRISTIANS' REVIEW OF THE RELIGIOUS WORLD.

QUAKERISM.

"Ye blind guides, which strain out a gnat and swallow a camel." JESUS.

SINGULAR beyond all other sects, and not less specious than singular, are the principles and practices of the society of Friends. Addressed as our examination of Quakerism is,

not only to the religious world generally, but to such also of the Friends as will have the courage to read, and the candour to examine, the arguments directed against their system, we have endeavoured to avoid every appearence of illiberality, and to exhibit in the papers devoted to this subject, even at the risk of being dull, a body of evidence and of argument rather than content ourselves with mere declamation and satire. This sense, however, of what is due to candour and fairness of inquiry is equally compatible with an honest and fearless avowal of the truth, or what appears to us to be such; and this, in exhibiting our views of the Quakers, we shall continue to do even though a less portion of the complacency of the body should rest upon our labours than have attended those of CLARKSON and other of their *patronized* writers.*

Hitherto we have, by reference to the history and writings of this body, endeavoured to establish the fallacy and danger of their principles, and to prove the various errors in opinion and practice produced by the doctrine of the present influence of the spirit—of inward immediate revelation to the mind of man—a doctrine which forms the basis of the Quaker theology; and whose influence pervades and marks, and gives a distinctive character and peculiarity to the whole conduct of the professors of this system. In examining, as we purpose now more generally to do, the views and proceedings of this body, there is a rule by which we shall try them and against which we apprehend no fair and honest appeal can be made—we mean the rule of *consistency*. This rule is one of first importance in examining the principles and pretensions of any religious body—for truth is always consistent; and, where truth prevails, consistency will appear. Quakerism, if true, must be consistent with itself; the practices of its professors if sincere, must be in conformity with their principles. Agreeably to this rule of inquiry, then, we purpose to examine first, the opinions of the Quakers on the subject of WAR.

The peculiar views of the Friends with regard to war have long been matter of controversy among writers of different

---

* "Clarkson's portraiture of Quakerism" is generally known:—it is a dear dull work; and, although the author was not himself a Quaker, yet as his portraiture was a *flattering* one, the whole of a large impression was purchased by the Friends immediately on its issuing from the press. This is not exactly the reception which *our* "portraiture of Quakerism" meets among the Friends.

sects, and not unfrequently the theme of praise to many of their sentimental admirers. War, whether offensive or defensive—say the Quakers—is inconsistent with the spirit of the gospel. We do not object to this maxim; but then we maintain that all those passions and dispositions of men—all those maxims of government and principles of state policy which *lead* to war—and without which, war, in fact, could not exist—are equally inconsistent with the spirit of the gospel; and that any attempt to cure the effect without removing the cause, is an evidence either of ignorance or insincerity in the party making such attempt—"*Whence "come wars and fightings among you?*" (asks an apostle.) "*Come they not hence, even of your lusts that war in your "members?*" The passions then—the ambition—the false views of glory—either in individuals or nations—are the legitimated objects of correction or exposure—war being, indeed, but an effect and as inseparable from these, its immediate causes, and is the thunder-storm from that state of the elements which is overcharged with electric fire. Why then, do the Quakers confine their opposition to war as an abstract evil, without touching the *causes* by which war is produced? And yet upon this fallacy does the "PEACE SOCIETY" proceed—a society supported principally by the Quakers. Why—when in their efforts to suppress war the members of this society are seeking to obtain the patronage of the despots of Europe—of the kings and great ones of the earth—why do they not honestly declare to these crowned heads the great and guilty share which they, for their own ambitious purposes, have had in producing war? Why—if they are sincere in their opposition to this evil—why do they not raise their voices against the crimes of kings and cabinets—against those aggressions upon public liberty—against that system of spoliation and of interference with the concerns of independent nations, of which we have seen so much in modern times, and which have invariably provoked resistance and ended, not only in war but in what is yet a greater evil settled despotism?—And yet the "Peace Society" invoke the aid, and solicit "the coun-"tenance and support" of the emperor Alexander, the autocrat of Russia, and all her barbarous hordes, for the extirpation of war, whom they describe as "*a monarch whose "professed opinions favour this glorious object, and whose actions "happily confirm the sincerity of those professions*"!!!*—

* See address of the chairman of the committee of the Peace Society to the Emperor Alexander.—*Times*, Feb. 8, 1819.

Is this hypocrisy, or is it simple folly? What would be thought of the sense or sincerity of an association for the suppression of war upon a smaller scale—of *pugilism* for example—and who, to promote that object, should present an adulatory address to, and praise the pacific conduct of, the *Mendozas* and *Big Bens* of the prize ring?

But if war be sinful, all intriguing which is calculated to promote war—all countenance and support of either of the belligerents—must be sinful also. If, then, it shall appear that the Quakers have been guilty of such intrigue—if they have supported the strong against the weak—if they have upheld power against right, and secretly been found to bolster up established corruption against necessary reform; then, in fact, are they wanting in consistency towards their own avowed principles, for they thereby encourage the incipient causes of war, and become, if we may speak in legal phrase, *accessaries before the fact*. The Quakers we know claim for themselves, in an eminent degree, *the harmlessness of the dove;* and we readily concede to them also so large a share of that other christian quality—*the wisdom of the serpent*—that it becomes difficult to fix upon them a charge like the present. There is about these people a cautiousness of habit—an apparent simplicity—a characteristic shrewdness—which eludes penetration and renders it difficult to detect their policy. There are, however, upon record, some instances of the conduct—either of conspicuous individuals or large portions of their body—which will serve to elucidate our point. Among all the tutelary saints of their church, there is not one more revered by the Quakers, or who is more richly enshrined in their affections, than WILLIAM PENN. It is not our intention either to investigate the merits, or to detract from the fame of this individual; but we confess ourselves puzzled—perplexed beyond measure—at finding the simple, the pious, the heavenly-minded William Penn, the favourite of a corrupt monarch and a licentious court; and it becomes still more difficult indeed to reconcile his court politics with his boasted hostility to war. Admiral Penn, his father, it is true, was distinguished by Cromwell, and obtained the favour of the two Stuarts, who possessed the throne after him—but then the *Admiral* was honoured for his *fighting qualities;* and it is difficult to conceive how these favours should descend to the son, who was a professed enemy to all war, unless indeed the *spiritual weapons* with which alone he fought were wielded in the service of the court! William Penn, it is certain, enjoyed the smiles of the profligate and tyrannical

Charles II. and was at once the favourite, the confidant, and political instrument of his equally worthless successor James. He is described by Burnet, who was his contemporary, and on terms of intimacy with him, as being "*entirely in the king's interest.*" It has, indeed, been pretended that Penn's attachment to Charles II. was in consequence of his proclamation in 1661, by which the persecutions of the Quakers were terminated; speaking of which act, on the part of Charles, a French writer has said, "He was one of those voluptuaries, whom the love of sensual pleasure sometimes excites to sentiments of compassion and humanity;"* and, certainly, that act whether of state policy or of inconsistent humanity on the part of Charles, however salutary its operation might have been on the Quakers, was no reason why Penn should have rendered himself the apologist of his every-day cruelties to the rest of his subjects; and that he was such appears, incidentally, from Burnet, to have been the case; who, in citing the testimony of Penn, as to the manner of the death of Cornish, states "*He said to me the king was much to pitied, who was hurried "into all this effusion of blood by Jefferies' impetuous and cruel "temper.*"—History of his own Times, 1724. Fol.

We are aware, that, in citing the authority of Bishop Burnet upon matters touching the public events of this period of history, we are adducing a witness whose judgment is liable to the suspicion of having been warped by his hostility to the House of Stuart, not to mention the active share he is known to have had in bringing about the Revolution. As far, however, as we have yet availed ourselves of Burnet's authority we may observe that his allusion to Penn is only incidental, and that he refers to him not with a view to disparage his name, but to establish a disputed fact in the history of his time; and any further use we may make of Burnet's history will be found generally supported and corroborated by other historians.

Pursuing the courtly and suspicious career of Penn we find him in the succeeding and last reign of the Stuarts intriguing at the court of the Prince of Orange, in order to induce him, as presumptive heir to the crown of England, to come into the king's measures, and to accede to the repeal of the *test* and *penal laws*. Without stopping to inquire into the policy or the justice of these laws, it may be sufficient to

* Raynal, vol. V. p. 325.

remark, that from no love of religious liberty did that bigot James seek to obtain their repeal; but solely with the view of introducing the Catholics into power, and thereby to overturn the liberties of England, and erect on their ruins the structure of absolute authority. And yet, according to Burnet, to these measures—so calculated to provoke resistance, and to end in blood—did Penn, the friend of peace, lend himself. Burnet, who, in the year 1686, two years only before the Revolution, was at the court of the Prince of Orange, states in his "*History of his own Time,*" that

"Complaints came daily over to England of all the high things that the priests were every where throwing out.—Penn, the Quaker, came over to Holland.- - - - He undertook to persuade the Prince to come into the king's measures, and had two or three long audiences of him upon the subject; and he and I spent some hours together on it. The prince readily consented to a *toleration* of popery as well as of dissenters, provided it were proposed and passed in Parliament, and he promised his assistance if there were need of it, to get it to pass. But for the *tests* he would enter into no treaty about them. He said it was a plan betraying the security of the protestant religion to give them up. *Nothing was left unsaid that might move him to agree to this in the way of interest.* The king would enter into an entire confidence with him, and would put his best Friends into the chief trusts. Penn undertook for this so positively that he seemed to believe it himself; or he was a great proficient in the art of dissimulation. Many suspected he was a concealed papist. It is certain he was much with *Father Peter,** and was particularly trusted by the *Earl of Sunderland;* so though he did not pretend any commission for what he promised, yet we looked upon him as a man employed."—Vol. i. p. 693—4.

The fact of Penn's diplomatic services being engaged on this occasion in behalf of a despotic king, against the just rights and liberties of his people, is also affirmed in the "*History of the House of Stuart, by the author of the critical History of England,* 1730;" but it is more completely corroborated by some other parts of Penn's conduct, all directed to the same end, the particulars of which we extract from one of our most valuable English histories.†

In 1687, a new Parliament being about to be called, James resolved on taking a tour through the midland counties, in order to influence the approaching election in favour of such candidates as were favourable to the introduction of the papists to power; the king's design being nothing less than to re-establish popery in the kingdom.

---

* *The king's confessor.*

† *Complete History of England.* London, 1706. Fol.

"It was to solicit this cause that the king took a large progress this summer; and one of his *closest attendants* was his *loyal friend* WILLIAM PENN, the reputed Quaker.—Vol. iii. p. 469.

During this progress with the king, Penn, it seems, paid visits to the various Quaker meetings, in the counties through which he travelled, and preached among them—his Majesty not unfrequently attending him, and becoming one of his auditors; all this being consistent with the crafty policy of the king, in enlisting the interests of the dissenters against the church. About this period it was, that the presidency of St. Mary Magdalen College, Oxford, having become vacant, the king sent letters mandatory in behalf of one Farmer, as a fit person to occupy the president's chair.—Farmer being a catholic, and a man of profligate life, the Fellows, disregarding his Majesty's recommendation, proceeded to elect Dr. Hough. This refractory conduct of the Fellows being so contrary to the king's sinister object of introducing the papists into the seats of learning, his Majesty became highly incensed; and determined, either by a QUO WARRANTO process to suppress the college, or expell the refractory members. Upon this occasion, and to induce submission to the king's measures, we find Penn manœuvreing with the College, as appears under his own hand:

"Yet before he made Magdalen College feel the weight of his displeasure, WILLIAM PENN the head of the Quakers, or as some then thought an *ambitious crafty Jesuit*, who under a fanatical outside promoted King James's design, was industriously employed—'not to entrap them,' (as he pretended in his letter to Dr. Bailey, one of the Fellows) but *out of a passionate concern for their interest*, to persuade them either to compliance with his Majesty's letter, or to think among themselves of some expedient to prevent the ruin of their college and themselves, and to offer it to his Majesty's consideration that the order for the QUO WARRANTO against the colleges might be recalled before it was too late; for they could not but be sensible how highly his Majesty was incensed against them. 'Every mechanic' (adds Penn) 'knows the temper of his present Majesty, who never will receive a baffle in any thing that he heartily espouses. When there are so many statutes to be observed, it is impossible but *some must be broken at some time or other;* and I am informed, by the learned in the law, that a failure in any one point forfeits your grant and lays your college open to the royal displeasure. I could give many other *prudent arguments* that might possibly incline you to put an end to your troubles, *almost at any rate*: but I shall only suggest this one thing to you, that your fatal overthrow would be a fair beginning of the so-much-aimed-at *Reformation*—first, of *the university*, then of *the church*; and administer such an opportunity to the enemy as may not perhaps occur in his Majesty's reign.'"—P. 478.

Let the duplicity of this letter speak for itself, and let the Friends reconcile it to their principles, if they can, that

this celebrated Quaker with whom their cause is so closely identified, should, by an appeal to the corrupt interest of the members of the university, suggest his *prudent arguments* against the '*reformation of the church,*' and in behalf of the *colleges* which, whether possessed by Catholics or Protestants, are notoriously the sinks of ecclesiastical corruption.

Our case however against Penn does not stop here; for, after the Revolution, he stands accused in history of being implicated in a plot for the re-establishment of arbitrary power; which, if successful, must have produced war of the most disastrous kind.—We mean civil war.

"The whole (says Smollet) amounted to an invitation to the French king to assist King James in re-ascending the English throne, upon certain conditions, while William should be absent from the kingdom: but the scheme was ill-layed and countenanced but by a very few persons of distinction; among whom the chief were the Earl of Clarendon; the Bishop of Ely; Lord Preston, his brother; Mr. Graham; and PENN, THE FAMOUS QUAKER."—Vol. 8, p. 404, 3rd Ed.

Doubts have arisen, indeed, as to the legal proof upon which *Ashton,* servant to James's Queen, who had hired the vessel to bring the king over from France, was found guilty: he however suffered the highest penalty of the law. The Earl of Clarendon was sent to the Tower. "The bishop of "Ely," (says Smollet) "Graham, and Penn, *absconded;* "and a proclamation was issued for apprehending them as "traitors!"*

Penn it seems was obliged to remain *au secret* for the space of two or three years; and contrived afterwards, with much difficulty, to disentangle himself from the toils into which his attachment for corrupt and despotic power had brought him. But what a practical illustration does all this evidence afford of the inconsistency—the *hypocrisy,* may we not say—of the much-talked-of abhorrence of the Quakers to war. Here is one of their chief apostles—a professed harbinger from Heaven—with professions of peace upon his lips, and at the same time rendering himself the pander to corrupt power, and secretly fomenting that war which he so loudly deprecates and so sympathetically deplores. To be consistent with his profession, the Quaker, we say, should abstain from all political interference with either party whether power or liberty be the object contended for; but

* See also *Burnet's History of his own Time,* and *Rapin's History of England.*

here is a man who acts at once inconsistently and wickedly —inconsistently in taking *any* part, and wickedly in taking that of oppression and cruelty against liberty and humanity!

James, let it be remembered, was a declared papist; and his known object was to introduce into the three kingdoms popery, with its attendant persecutions, its dungeons, and its fires. So great, indeed, was his zeal in this cause, that even the Pope (Innocent XI) thought it prudent in one of his briefs, whilst commending his zeal for the Catholic religion, to express his apprehension lest "it should carry him *too far* and instead of contributing to the advancement of his own affairs, and the interest of religion, be of extreme prejudice to both." And yet this is the man to whom Penn—a Quaker—a dissenter and a professed friend to the rights of conscience—allied himself; rendering himself his adviser—his instrument—and, as we have seen, his travelling companion, when the king was artfully seeking to corrupt the minds of the people and extend the influence of the court. What shall we say to such things? What would be said, if such things had occurred in primitive times? How would the unbeliever triumph, and how would the Christian blush, if it appeared upon record that Jesus of Nazareth had been the confidant, the adviser and instrument of the corrupt and cruel *Herod?* That in disseminating his religion Herod was sometimes his travelling companion—sometimes his hearer; whilst the herald of christianity was at the same time promoting the corrupt and wicked designs of Herod against the rights and liberties of his countrymen? Will it be said that the conduct of Penn was that of an individual only, and that the Quakers, as a body, were not implicated therein? This might, indeed, be alleged, with some show of truth, provided the Friends had censured or disowned Penn for his conduct: but when he was the object of admiration to the body whilst living, and whilst his memory continues to be embalmed in the odours of their constant praise, such a plea can never be consistently offered in behalf of the body.*

Turn we now to another instance illustrative of the inconsistency of the Quakers with regard to their avowed belief of the sinfulness of war.

During the struggles for liberty in America, when Great

---

* The evidence above adduced proves how fallacious is the plea that Penn's attendance at court was merely to prosecute the claims he had on the government, on behalf of various sums of money advanced by his father; and

Britain was seeking by her fleets, her armies, and her gold, to bring the colonies under her subjection, the Quakers of Philadelphia, put forth a paper, entitled—" *The* ANCIENT TESTIMONY *and* PRINCIPLES *of the People called* QUAKERS, *renewed with respect to the* KING *and* GOVERNMENT; *and touching the commotions now prevailing in these and other parts of America. Addressed to the People in England.*"

In this paper the Quakers say—

" It hath ever been our judgment and principle since we were called to profess the light of Christ Jesus, manifested in our consciences unto this day, that the setting up and putting down kings and governments is God's peculiar prerogative, for causes best known to himself, and that it is not our business to have any hand or contrivance therein; nor to be *busy-bodies* above our stations, much less to plot and contrive the ruin or overturn of any of them; but to pray for the king, and safety of our nation, and good of all men; that we might live a peaceable and quiet life, in all godliness and honesty, *under the government which God is pleased to set over us.*"

After much more in the same canting strain, these meddling, officious " *busy-bodies,*" who venture to denounce others as assuming that character, call upon Friends—

" Firmly to unite in the abhorrence of all such writings and measures, as evidence a desire and design to break off the *happy* connexion we have hitherto enjoyed with the kingdom of Great Britain, and our just and necessary subordination to the king, and those who are lawfully placed in authority under him."

Of the inconsistency and hypocrisy of this *testimony* of the Quakers against war, there appeared at the time so masterly and manly an exposure, which is, at the same time, so much to our present purpose, that we cannot resist the transcribing a portion of it. What follows, is from the pen of Thomas Paine; a writer, whose subsequent infidelity, indeed, we cannot but deplore; which infidelity, however,

---

for which he afterwards received a grant from the crown, of the province lying on the west side of the Delaware, North America, subsequently called by his name: nor can we enter into the rhapsodies of those writers who have panegerized Penn's benevolence for afterwards *purchasing*, as it has been said, of the Indian tribes, that tract of country which it is assumed, was already his own by virtue of the crown grant. This might have been good policy, indeed, to confirm his own title by extinguishing an existing claim;—but the world has never yet been informed *how much* Penn gave the Indians for their right in the country. Pennsylvania is a fine tract of country, lying contiguous to New York, comprehending upwards of forty thousand square miles; intersected by several navigable rivers, and possessing a fine climate. *Query*, how many *hatchets* and *glass beads* did the Quaker give the Indian proprietors as purchase money for this estate?

may perhaps be fairly attributable to his *Quaker* education; combining, as Quakerism does, with its own obnoxious peculiarities, most of the objectionable doctrines of modern orthodoxy.*

Addressing himself to the Quakers, in reply to the above hypocritical testimony, Mr. Paine proceeds :—

"The two first pages (and the whole doth not make four) we give you credit for, and expect the same civility from you, because the love and desire of peace is not confined to Quakerism; it is the *natural* as well as religious wish of all denominations of men: and on this ground, as men labouring to establish an independent constitution of our own, do we exceed all others in hope, end, and aim. *Our plan is, peace for ever!* - - - *We* fight neither for revenge nor conquest; neither from pride nor passion. *We* are not insulting the world with our fleets and armies, nor ravaging the globe

---

* That our opinion as to the cause of Paine's infidelity is not without ground, the following extracts from his "Age of Reason" will attest:—"My father being of the Quaker profession, it was my good fortune to have an exceedingly good moral education, and a tolerable stock of useful learning." - - - "From the time I was capable of conceiving an idea, and acting upon it by reflection, I either doubted the truth of the Christian system, or thought it to be a strange affair—I scarcely knew which it was; but I well remember, when about seven or eight years of age, hearing a sermon read by a relation of mine, who was a great devotee of the church, upon the subject of what is called *redemption by the death of the Son of God.* After the sermon was ended, I went into the garden (for I perfectly recollect the spot): I revolted at the recollection of what I had heard, and thought to myself, it was making God Almighty act like a passionate man, that killed his son when he could not revenge himself any other way; and as I was sure a man would be hanged that did such a thing, I could not see for what purpose they preached such sermons. This was not one of those kind of thoughts that had any thing in it of childish levity—it was to me a serious reflection, arising from the idea I had, that God was too good to do such an action, and also too almighty to be under any necessity of doing it. I believe in the same manner to this moment; and I moreover believe, that any system of religion that has any thing in it that shocks the mind of a child, cannot be a true system."

This doctrine of the vicarious sacrifice of Christ, we may observe, is as well a doctrine of *Quakerism* as of *Church of Englandism*, but it is not a doctrine of Christianity.

Referring to a similar point in our last paper, the reader will not fail to perceive from the following extract, how easy was the transition in Paine's mind, from Quakerism to infidelity.

"The religion that approaches the nearest of all others to *true Deism*, in the moral and benign part thereof, is that professed by the Quakers: but they have contracted themselves too much by leaving the works of God out of their system. Though I reverence their philanthrophy, I cannot help smiling at the conceit, that if the taste of a Quaker had been consulted at the creation, what a *silent and drab-coloured creation* it would have been! not a flower would have blossomed its gaities, nor a bird been permitted to sing!"

for plunder. Beneath the shade of our own vines we are attacked; in our own houses, and in our own land, is the violence committed against us. We view our enemies in the character of highwaymen and housebreakers; and having no defence for ourselves in the civil law, are obliged to punish them by the military one, and apply the sword in the very case you have before now applied the halter. Perhaps we feel for the ruined and insulted sufferers in all and every part of the continent, with a degree of tenderness which hath not yet made its way into some of your bosoms. But be you sure that ye mistake not the cause and ground of your testimony. Call not coldness of soul religion, nor put the *bigot* in the place of the Christian. O ye partial ministers of your own acknowledged principles! if the bearing arms be sinful, the *first going to war* must be more so, by all the difference between wilful attack, and unavoidable defence. Wherefore, if ye really preach from conscience, and mean not to make a political hobby-horse of your religion, convince the world thereof, by proclaiming your doctrine to our enemies, *for they likewise bear arms.* Give us a proof of your sincerity, by publishing it at *St. James's*, to the commanders in chief at Boston, to the admirals and captains who are piratically ravaging our coasts, and to all the murdering miscreants who are acting in authority under —— * * * * Had ye the honest soul of Barclay, ye would preach repentance to your —— * * * * * * * * * ye would not spend your partial invectives against the injured and the insulted only, but like faithful ministers, would cry aloud, and *spare none.*"

The Quakers in their testimony, had cited a passage from the Proverbs, in order to convince the Americans that the opposition of Great Britain was designed as a punishment to their sins; upon which citation, Paine remarks—

"The quotation which ye have made from Proverbs, in the third page of your testimony, that "*when a man's ways please the Lord, he maketh even his* "*enemies to be at peace with him,*" is very unwisely chosen on your part; because it amounts to a proof, that the —— whom ye are so desirous of supporting, does *not* please the Lord, otherwise *his* reign would be in peace."—P. 86. New edit. London, 1791.

The inconsistency and the duplicity of the Quakers on this occasion, cannot be rendered more obvious to the reader by any remarks of our own. In the war for American independence, it is true, that some portion of the Quakers did bear arms in support of that great and glorious revolution: Quakerism, however, must not claim the merit even of this inconsistency, as for such conduct, it is well known, they were disowned by the society, and are still, as we are informed, known in America by the appellation of—the *fighting Quakers.*

Enough, we think, has been said to shew how little the love of peace is acted upon, as a principle, by the society of Friends. In the American war we see them raising their voices against the oppressed; and in the French war

which followed it, and which was a war, in fact, against the reform of abuses, and the extension of liberal opinions, we find them silent as the grave, and offering to the world, not only no testimony against the iniquitous principles which marked its wasteful and sanguinary career; but on the contrary, as far as they could, did they aid and support the aggressors, as is sufficiently evinced by the public contributions of the Quakers, of *shoes* and *flannels* to a large amount, for the supply of our soldiers, which were, as is well known, emblazoned forth in the public prints of the day. It may be said, that these were instances of humanity on the part of the Friends; but might not the same plea of extenuation be urged, if even they should undertake to contribute to the clothing and comfort of a party of highwaymen or housebreakers, and that whilst pursuing their lawless occupation? At any rate, it might be expected that humanity would have prompted the making similar contributions to the *French* soldiers, whose greater distress at that time strengthened their claims to compassionate consideration!

Connected with the views of the Friends on the subject of war, perhaps not the least singular circumstance is, that the early Quakers appear to have been far less peaceably inclined than those of succeeding generations. In perusing the history of the times in which they first originated, we meet with so many traces of their turbulent spirit—of their interference with the established authorities of the times, as to render it extremely doubtful, whether the spirit by which they were moved came to bring peace on earth, or a sword. Cromwell, who was not a man to be affected by groundless fears, entertained, it is certain, much apprehension of the early Quakers; although he bore the rude insults and denunciations of their prophets, delivered sometimes in the presence of his court, with singular equanimity and forbearance.

Colonel Lilburn, a violent opponent of the government of the Protector, became, whilst a prisoner at Dover Castle, converted to Quakerism:—

"Whilst Lilburn was a prisoner here, (says Sewell, the Quaker historian) Cromwell, as it seemed, would have released him if he would have signed a declaration that he would never draw a sword against his government. But Lilburn, as yet not being fully convinced that to refrain the use of the carnal sword, was the duty of the true Christian, *refused;* thinking that though George Fox had signed such a declaration, yet this did not become him, because *he did not perfectly approve that point of self-denial.*"—P. 124.

The prison discipline, however, to which Lilburn was exposed, tended, as it would seem, more readily than his *light within*, to convince him of the wickedness of bearing the sword, and he subsequently consented to give the declaration required by Cromwell.

During the political commotions, which, in the year 1659, preceded the Restoration, Sewell confesses, that "Since "some rash people that went under the name of Quakers, "*were for taking up arms under* LAMBERT; and that the "Committee of Safety offered great places and commands "to some of *that persuasion*, thereby to draw them off from "the truth they professed, George Fox wrote a paper, "wherein he shewed the unlawfulness of wars and fight-"ings."—P. 211. Upon the suspicious conduct of the Quakers, thus artfully put by their historiographer, additional light will be thrown on the part borne by them at this feverish crisis, by an extract from the "*State Pa-"pers, collected by Edward, Earl of Clarendon,*" and bearing date in the April of the following year, to which the quotation from Sewell bears reference.

"*Major Wood to the Lord Chancellor Hyde.*

SIR,—In my last I gave you my opinion (as required) that this business would not end without blows. We have been, and still are very near it; for upon Wednesday last, Harrison was to rise in Wales, and Lambert in the north, and some others in other parts.

This is the first time that any of the considerable QUAKERS *have joined with* LAMBERT, *many of them having sold their whole estates to raise money for their present design. April* 20, 1660."—Vol. iii. p. 730.

In addition to the evidence already offered upon the point under consideration, there is abundant proof that the early Quakers, if they did not themselves bear the *carnal sword*, yet that they aided and abetted its use in the hands of others; so much so, indeed, as to render it doubtful whether their abstaining from actual service resulted from *conscience* or from *cowardice*. Several of the early papers given out by Fox, Burroughs, and Howgill—and addressed, some to the Protector, and some to his soldiers—assume a truly warlike tone; and were designed as messages from heaven, to urge them on to destroy, by *force of arms*, popery and idolatry. In one of these papers Fox declares to Cromwell, that had he followed his counsel—

"The Hollanders had been thy subjects—had given up to thy will; and the Spaniard had quivered like a dry leaf: the king of France should have bowed under thee his neck; the Pope should have withered as in the

winter; the Turk in all his fatness, should have smoked; thou shouldst have crumbled nations to dust. Therefore, let thy *soldiers* go forth with a free and willing heart, that thou mayest rock nations as a cradle: for a mighty work hath the Lord to do in other nations, and their quakings and shakings are but entering. So this is the word of the Lord God to thee, as a charge to thee from the Lord God," &c.—*G. Fox's counsel and advice, in a Letter to Oliver Cromwell; dated 11th month*, 1657.

In one of the prophetic effusions of the celebrated Burroughs, the soldiers are exhorted to "*Slay Balaam!*"—"*Vex the Midianites!*"—"*Remember Amalek!*"—"*Give the priests blood to drink!*" But the consistency of all these warlike fulminations with the declared antipathy of the Quakers to war—the consistency of their conduct in exciting and goading others to do what they themselves declare to be sinful, it remains for our modern Quakers, the devoted and admiring disciples of these great Goliahs of their cause, to reconcile and explain; and when we see them—as in modern times we have more than once seen them, whilst they are laying an almost exclusive claim to the title of Friends of Peace—supporting the *cause* of war, by upholding all those corrupt institutions, measures, and men, which produce war, we are tempted to compare them to the trumpeter in the fable; who, when he called for quarter, on the ground that he did not fight, was told, that he was doubly deserving of death, for inciting others to the combat.

Connected in some measure with this subject, is the *Loyalty*—the known, the boasted *Loyalty* of the Quakers; a curious illustration of which, is afforded in the period of history just under review. As a body, it is certain, they were professed enemies to all kingly government. We have seen them, upon the admission of Sewell, and upon the evidence of Clarendon, joining to oppose the restoration of Charles II. Various are the papers in which George Fox condemned, as wicked and anti-christian, all kingly authority: the prudence of his followers have, however, caused most of these records of republican zeal to disappear: one such paper, however, more moderate than the rest, Sewell does suffer to remain in his journal of Quakerism.—"In the year 1658," says Sewell, p. 179, "when "there was much talk of making Cromwell king, George "Fox wrote to the Protector in these words:"—

"*O Protector!*—Who hast tasted of the power of God, which many generations before thee hath not so much since the days of apostacy from the apostles, take heed that thou lose not thy power; but *keep kingship off thy head*, which the world would give to thee, and earthly crowns under thy feet, lest with that thou cover thyself, and so lose the power of God. When

the children of Israel went from that of God in them, they would have *kings* as other nations had, as transgressors had, and so God gave them one; *and what did they do then?*—George Fox."

The date of this paper was *two* years before the restoration. There is, however, a more bitter invective against monarchial government contained in a book written by George Fox, and for the preservation of which we are indebted to the care and industry of Mr. Leslie, one of the most powerful and laborious opponents with whom Quakerism has had to contend. This book of Fox's was published at the commencement of the year 1660, the restoration taking place in the May of the same year: its title is, "*Several Papers given forth by George Fox. London; printed* "*for Thomas Symonds, at the sign of* THE BULL, 1660." Ominous, indeed, was the sign at which this unlucky book was printed; for therein Fox declares, p. 8. "*that all kings* "*and emperors have sprung up in the night of time, since the* "*days of the apostles, among the antichrists.*"—P. 12. "*So* "*the Christians go out from Christ, and set up kings, like the* "*heathen.*"—P. 16. "*We know that these kings are the spi-* "*ritual Egyptians, got up since the days of the apostles.*"—P. 9. "*Are not all these Christians that will dote so much of an* "*earthly king, traitors against Christ? And will these that* "*are true Christians, have any more kings among them but* "*Christ?*" This paper of Fox's was published only a few weeks before the appearance of the king in London, on the 29th of May; and on the 5th of June, the Quakers drew up "a declaration of their sincerity and good wishes to the "government," which, on the 22d of the same month, Fox himself put into the king's hand; in which declaration they say—"*We do therefore declare, to take off all jealousies, fears,* "*and suspicions of our truth and fidelity* TO THE KING *and the* "*present governors, that our intentions and endeavours are and* "*shall be good, true, honest, and peaceful towards them; and* "*that we do* LOVE, OWN, *and* HONOUR THE KING, *and these* "*present governors!!!*"

Sewell gravely assures us, that Fox was favoured with a prophetic *insight* of the restoration of Charles II. One would hardly have suspected this; but at any rate, the Quakers must suppose, that *the spirit* by which the writings of Fox profess to have been dictated, was guilty of *treasonable correspondence* when it dictated such sentiments as we have exhibited, against royalty: upon which supposition, we presume, it was, that in the editions of the writings of Fox, Burroughs,

Howgill, and others, published *after* the restoration, most of the offensive papers or passages against royalty, have been *suppressed!* Speaking of which duplicity on the part of the Friends, Mr. Leslie, who it appears had in his possession a copy of Fox's *radical* paper, issued immediately before the restoration, says, after quoting the title at length—

"I set it down thus particularly, because the Friends may know that it is still in being, and in the hands of those who will watch the new edition of Fox's works, that they shall neither add nor diminish without being told of it. I give this caution, because great pains has been taken (and by some arts which I will not mention here) to recover this book out of the hands of any who are in the least disaffected to their cause; and it may rationally be supposed, that the design is either *wholly to suppress it*, or to take out its *sting*, that it hurt them not, and render them odious to *all kingly government*."

Upon the inconsistency, the art, the worldly policy, suggested by the conduct of the Quakers, as exhibited in all these transactions, the reader may safely be left to form his own conclusions; as regards, however, the sins of the early Quakers against regal authority, it must be confessed, that those of the present generation have amply atoned for all errors committed in this respect, by their less courtly progenitors:—of which more in its proper place.

Quitting this subject, we proceed to notice another peculiarity of the sect—we allude to their *assumed plainness and apparent simplicity in dress, manners, habits, and discourse.*

A departure from all such customs of the world as are in themselves pernicious, is, undoubtedly, the duty of those who profess discipleship to Jesus. No fashions, however general—no maxims, however popular—if inconsistent with the precepts of Jesus and the spirit of Christianity—should be countenanced, much less adopted by Christians: but to depart from established customs in speech, dress, or behaviour, merely because they *are* established, is an evidence of ignorance, and frequently an indication of pride; proceeding as it too commonly does, not from a love of simplicity, but from an appetite for singularity. The Jews, who were the people of God, appear in their public buildings, their habitations, and their dress, to have consulted taste, and not wholly to have discarded elegance. Jesus and his apostles, as Jews, adopted the dress and habits of their countrymen: there is no trace of the least singularity, or of any affectation of peculiar plainness of garb, as distinguishing *them* from their Jewish brethren. Some, indeed, there were in their days who *did* exhibit certain religious peculiarities of dress, the hypocrisy of which Jesus did not fail to expose: hence, we find him condemning,

not indeed the *broad brims*, but the *broad phylacteries* of the Pharisees of his day: but Jesus himself, we say, affected no peculiar plainness of garb. The Roman soldiers, at the crucifixion, it appears, divided his garments, and cast lots for his vesture, on account, as it should seem, of its value; but the possession of the *leathern doublet* of George Fox, however precious, as a relic, it might be esteemed by the faithful, would hardly, we apprehend, have been worth disputing by the soldiers of Cromwell or of Charles. Whilst, however, Jesus and his apostles exhibited by their example, this wise conformity to all the innocent customs of their day, yet did they reprobate and condemn all extravagance, all improper and undue attention to the adorning of the person, and to the pursuit of such things, to the neglect of those concerns which are of real and lasting importance. Such then is the rule of Christianity on this subject, as it is also that of reason and good sense. William Penn, indeed, whilst he could reconcile it to the simplicity of his profession to appear at court, and dance attendance on royalty, yet does ye with all the zeal of apparent sincerity, move heaven and earth, and bring all the authority of the scriptures, and the classics, against an extra fold in the coat or pleat in the dress, as though the latter could contribute to flatter the pride and vanity of men in any degree equal to the former.—In his "*No Cross, no Crown*," Penn argues thus,

"We are taught by the scriptures of truth to believe that *sin brought the first coat!* and if consent of writers be of force, it was as well without as within: to those that so believe I direct my discourse, because they, I am sure, are the generallity. I say, if *sin brought the first coat* poor Adam's offspring have little reason to be proud or curious in their cloths; for it seems their original was base, and the finery of them will neither make them noble, nor man innocent again. - - - - Since, therefore, guilt brought shame, and shame an apron and a coat, how very low are they fallen that glory in their shame —that are proud of their fall? For so they are that use care and cost to train and set off the very badge and livery of that lamentable lapse." P. 218, 14 Edit.

Again, speaking of those who lead the fashions, together with those heathens and heretics the tailors and semstresses, he says,

"That such persons are both the inventors and actors of all these follies cannot be difficult to demonstrate for were it possible that any one could bring us *Father Adam's girdle* and *Mother Eve's apron*, what laughing—what sleering—what mocking of their homely fashions would there be! Surely *their tailor* would find but little custom, although we read it was God himself that made them coats of skin." P. 261.

Now this reasoning, though calculated only to excite our risibility, would, at any rate, exhibit the merit of consistency if the Quakers had contented themselves with *Adam's girdle* and *Eve's apron*. If *they* had never departed from these homely fashions—if *they* had never advanced further in civilization than the primitive '*coats of skin*.' Mr. Penn's argument, and, indeed, the *principle* of the Quaker hypothesis on the subject of dress, must carry us back to the fashions of the garden of Eden—the broad cloth and broad brims of the Quakers being as much a departure from these as the embroidery of France, or the silks of India. But it will be said that plainness and simplicity of dress is all that is contended for by the Friends. We do not object either to plainness and simplicity of dress, or to plainness and simplicity of speech; but we *do* object that their plainness and simplicity, real or pretended, should be confined to matters of minor importance—we *do* object that whilst it is esteemed to be vain and sinful to wear any other colours than drabs and browns that it should not be esteemed vain and sinful to adopt wordly and selfish maxims, meanly to court the patronage of the affluent and the great, and to live for little else than the acquisition of this world's riches!

And can any religious sect, we would ask, present a stronger proof of the corrupting influence of riches than the Quakers themselves, whose members, as soon as they become rich, are known to throw off the restraints of the society; and a large portion of them (unwilling any longer to continue "on a short allowance of sin,") to reject even its name and renounce its communion?—How many of such, if it were necessary, could we identify, whose names stand connected with the chief banking houses, breweries, and mercantile establishments of the day!

In the mental abstractions of the mystics—in their constant meditations and severe and lonely lives, we trace the origin of Quakerism. The primitive mystics regarded life as a scourge, and a curse. The senses they considered not as sources of pleasurable enjoyment but as traps and snares to betray them into sin; and the chief business of life they held to consist in privation and self-inflicted torment—in the mortification of the body, that the soul might be sublimated and raised to the joys of heaven. If *they* disdained the concerns of dress and outward appearance it was because they disdained *all* the concerns of life, as calculated to withdraw them from that heavenly contemplation, in which their days and nights were constantly spent.

They lived in caves, or miserable huts; they consorted with beasts of the desert; they fed on grass and herbs; they continued for years in the same solitary spot, absorbed in heavenly contemplation. Here at least was consistency; and from this storehouse of pious fanaticism, it is evident that George Fox drew the materials of Quakerism. A propensity towards this abstraction from the worlds, marks the early life and writings not only of Fox but of most of the primitive Quakers;—but how is the scene changed with those of the present generation who inherit their name! Plainness of dress, indeed, we must concede to them: but even their plainness is more expensive than the finery of their neighbours. Their abstinence from wordly gratification is confined to matters of minor importance—to certain shades in silk, and to a certain cut in a coat—to music, or to pictures; whilst they are constantly possessing themselves, with an adroitness in which they have few equals, with all the enjoyments and luxuries of this life, and are as devoted worshippers at the shrine of Mammon as any of the sordid sons of this evil generation. To their acquisition of wealth, indeed, there would be the less objection provided it were honourably obtained and usefully directed. We complain only of their inconsistency—of their affectation—of their daintiness as regards some of the enjoyments of life, whilst they feast to repletion on those that are the more substantial!

Of the love of money Penn has himself given so correct a description, that if he had intended to draw the portraiture of Quakerism in the present day the likeness could not have been more complete.

"And truly it is a reproach to a man, especially the religious man, that he knows not when he hath enough—when to leave off—when to be satisfied:—that notwithstanding God sends him one plentiful season of grain after another he is so far from making that the cause of withdrawing from the traffic of the world, that he makes it a reason of launching further into it; as if the more he hath the more he may. He therefore reneweth his appetite; bestirs himself more then ever that he may have a share in the scramble, while any thing is to be got—this is as if cumber, not retirement; and gain, not content; were the duty and comfort of a christian.---- How can it be otherwise when those that have from a low condition acquired thousands, labour yet to advance, yea, double and treble those thousands; and that with the same care and contrivance by which they got them? Is this to live comfortably, or to be rich? Do we not see how early they rise—how late they go to bed? How full of the *change*—the *shop*—the *warehouse*—the *custom-house*; of *bills*, *bonds*, *charter parties* they are? Running up and down as if it were to save the life of a condemned innocent.---- And if this care, contrivance, and industry, and that continually, be not from

the love of money, in those that have ten times more than they began with, and much more than they spend or need, I know not what testimony man can give of his love to any thing."—*No Cross, No Crown*, p. 196 to 198.

In our view of the inconsistency of the Quakers, both as regards their non-conformity and their conformity with the world, we find ourselves so ably supported by the Edinburgh Reviewers, in their masterly review of Clarkson's portraiture of Quakerism, that we trust we shall stand excused with the reader for the length of our extracts from that journal.

"The basis of the Quaker morality seems evidently to be, that gaiety and merriment ought upon all occasions to be discouraged; that every thing which tends merely to exhiliration or enjoyment has in it a taint of criminality; and that one of the chief duties of man is to be always serious and solemn; and constantly occupied either with his worldly prosperity or his eternal welfare. If it were not for the attention which is permitted to the accumulation of wealth, the Quakers would scarcely be distinguishable from the other gloomy sectaries, who maintain that man was put into this world for no other purpose but to mortify himself into a proper condition for the next; that all our feelings of ridicule and sociality, and all the spring and gaiety of the animal spirits of youth, were given us only for our temptation; and that, considering the shortness of this life, and the risk he runs of damnation after it, man ought evidently to pass his days in dejection and terror; and to shut his heart to every pleasurable emotion which this transitory scene might supply to the unthinking. The fundamental folly of these ascetic maxims has prevented the Quakers from adopting them in their full extent; but all the peculiarity of their manners may evidently be referred to this source; and the qualifications and exceptions under which they maintain the duty of abstaining from enjoyment, serve only, in most instances, to bring upon their reasonings the additional charge of inconsistency." Vol. X. p. 86.

Although Clarkson disclaims, on the part of the Quakers, the opinion that our well-being in this life is a matter not worth the concern of the Christian—yet, says the Reviewer,

"There is evidently a tacit aspiration after this sublime absurdity in almost all the Quaker prohibitions; and we strongly suspect that honest George Fox, when he inhabited a hollow tree in the vale of Beevor, taught nothing less to his disciples. The condemnation of music and dancing, and all idle speaking, was, therefore, quite consistent in him; but, since the permission of gainful arts, and of most of the luxuries which wealth can procure to his disciples, it is no longer so easy to reconcile these condemnations either to reason or to the rest of their practice. A Quaker may suspend the care of his salvation, and occupy himself entirely with his worldly business for six days in the week, like any other Christians. It is even thought laudable in him to set an example of diligence and industry to those around him; and the fruits of this industry he is by no means required to bestow in relieving the poor, or for the promotion of piety: he is allowed to employ it for self gratification, in almost every way, but the most social and agreeable. He may keep an excellent table and garden, and be driven about in an easy chariot by a pious coachman and four plump horses; but

his plate must be without carving, and his carriage and horses (perhaps his *flowers* also) of a *dusky colour*. His guests may talk of oxen and broadcloth as long as they think fit, but wit and gaiety are entirely proscribed, and topics of literature but rarely tolerated. His girls and boys are bred up to a premature knowledge of bargaining and housekeeping; but when their bounding spirits are struggling in every limb, they must not violate their sedateness by a single skip—their *stillness* must not be disturbed by raising their voices beyond their common pitch—and they would be disowned if they were to tune their innocent voices in a hymn to their great benefactor.* We cannot help saying that all this is absurd and indefensible. Either let the Quakers renounce all the enjoyments of this life, or take all that are innocent. The pursuit of wealth surely holds out a greater temptation to immorality than the study of music. Let them disown those who accumulate more than is necessary for their subsistence, or permit those who have leisure to employ it in something better than money-getting. To permit a man to have a house and retinue, from the expenses of which fifty poor families might be supported, and, at the same time, to interdict a fold in his coat, or a ruffle to his shirt, on account of their costliness and vanity is as ridiculous and as superstitious as it is for the church of Rome to permit one of her cardinals to sit down, on a meagre day, to fifty costly and delicate dishes of fish and pastry, while it excommunicates a peasant for breaking through the holy abstinence fast with a morsel of rusty bacon."

Sufficient we apprehend has now been offered to prove the inconsistency of the Quakers in their affected opposition to the fashions and pursuits of the world; but, looking to the wealth of many of their members, is there not also a danger that a pernicious influence may be exercised on the discipline and proceedings of the body from this source. That such is the case has been frequently suspected; and, notwithstanding the boasted equality of the members of the society of Friends, their discipline is peculiarly favourable to such a corrupt influence. Instances have not of late been wanting of individuals having been expelled the society for heterodoxy—for holding opinions different from those which are now fashionable among the Friends. Such was the recent case of *Thomas Foster;* who, after having been fifty years a member of the society of Friends, was disowned for his

* Some exceptions to the strictness of the Quaker discipline, in all of these respects, have, however, been mentioned to us. We have heard of a rich Quaker gentleman who, in his *private study*, was wont to gratify his propensity for music with a certain Italian professor. We could name the sons of a grave Quaker whose judgment in horses and dogs is little inferior to that of any gentlemen of the turf, and who rank among the first bloods of their neighbourhood. We have heard, also, of a runaway match between the daughter of a celebrated Quakeress and a sea-captain.

disbelief of the doctrine of the Trinity; or rather, as the Quakers put it, "*the ground of the meeting's judgment, was* "*not that Thomas Foster, entertained scruples, doubts, and* "*certain opinions, but his injudicious proclamation of them.* Now to say nothing of the monstrous injustice of bringing a member of a religious community to trial for *injudiciously* proclaiming his opinions, yet, in any society professing the forms of liberty, the sense of the members in regard to the guilt or innocence of any accused party, who has been heard in his defence before them, is taken in a manner that can leave no room for doubt or suspicion. Among the Quakers, however, it is far otherwise, for in *their* meetings for discipline, as Mr. Clarkson confesses, "*matters are decided not* "*by majorities, or the influence of numbers, but by the* "*WEIGHT OF RELIGIOUS CHARACTER.*" Mr. Foster complains of this in his own instance

"The members of the society (says Mr. Foster) are not only allowed, but advised to be present, and may express their opinions on any subject under discussion; but, when the collective sense of the meeting is pretended to be taken, *no shew of hands is called for—no counting of numbers is permitted;* but the clerk records what he takes to be the sense of those whom he esteems to be *the most weighty Friends present:* and this passes, and is recorded, as the general sense of the assembly; and, in cases that admit of difference of sentiment, without any rational evidence of the fact. Those who, from diffidence or other causes, do not speak to the subject have no other means of expressing their opinion."—*A Narrative of the Proceedings of the Society, called Quakers, &c. against Thomas Foster,* p. 127, 1813.

But for this suspicious mode of taking the sense of the meeting there is reason to believe the decision in Mr. Foster's instance would have been different. This gentleman, however, as a Quaker, we submit, can have no ground of complaint; the thing, however unjust in itself, is consistent upon principle, for as all the proceedings of the members are supposed to be at the instigation of *the Spirit,* nothing could be more monstrous than to place *the Spirit* in the predicament of voting against itself. So then all points debated before the meetings of discipline are decided by the *weight of religious character;* and the clerk of the meeting collects what, upon this principle, *he* takes to be the sense of the meeting. If, then, any honest Quaker should, perchance, be guilty of *injudiciously proclaiming* his doubts of some pregnant absurdity held by the body, he is brought before the meeting; the formality of an accusation and defence is passed through, and he is declared guilty, or not guilty, according to the opinion of the clerk as to the

weight of religious character which may be for or against him. How, we should be curious to know, does Mr. Clerk weigh the weight of religious character? In what scales does he adjust and balance the various gifts and graces that may be collected together in a Quaker meeting of discipline? Is there no danger that, by reason of the infirmity of the flesh, he may mistake the weight of purse for the weight of character; and that pounds, shillings, and pence, should kick the beam, when balanced only against virtue, humility, and poverty? At any rate the case is open to suspicion; and an opinion does prevail, nor are facts wanting to strengthen that opinion, that a rich Quaker may do that with impunity which would not be tolerated in a poor one.

Passing on from this branch of our subject, there is between the primitive and modern Quakers a singular and striking variation which must be evident upon the slightest perusal of their early history compared with their present state—we allude to the active extravagance and boldness of the *Quaker spirit* in former times, compared with the caution and prudence which now-a-days it is found to prompt. Some instances of the operations of the spirit among the Quakers, in 1656, are briefly enumerated by *Neale*, who says

"The extravagance of their speakers was insufferable; one of them interrupted the minister in *Whitechapel Church*, and disturbed the whole assembly. A female came into Whitehall stark naked in the midst of public worship, the Lord Protector himself being present. Another came into Parliament House with a trenchard in her hand, which she broke in pieces; saying, thus shall ye be broke in pieces. Thomas Adams having complained to the Protector of the imprisonment of some Friends in the country, and not finding redress, he took off his cap and tore it in pieces; saying, so shall thy government be torn from thee and thy house. Several pretending an extraordinary mission from heaven, went about the streets of London denouncing the judgments of God against the Protector and the council. One came to the door of Parliament House with *a drawn sword*, and wounded several who were present; saying, he was inspired by the Holy Spirit to kill every man that sat in that house. Others, in their prophetic raptures, denounced judgments against the whole nation; and frequently disturbed the public assemblies when the chief magistrate himself was present."—*History of the Puritans*, vol. ii. p. 482.

In addition to these early instances of the operation of the spirit, there is upon record even so late as the reign of George II., an instance of a Quakeress who made her way into the House of Lords after the delivery of the king's speech, and read a lecture to their lordships, on the vanity

and sinfulness of dress. But how quietly, and how orderly does *the Spirit* now direct the Quaker to walk: it does not now prompt any breach of the peace, any violation of public decency and decorum, any terrors to men in authority—the Quaker is now as demure as formerly he was turbulent. Nor did the primitive Quakers exhibit merely a fanatical opposition to matters either of no importance or beyond their province; for, moved, as they say, and as their followers believe, by the spirit, their chief apostles and fathers were the first to expose the corruptions and vices of the age, and to denounce the Divine judgments against the cupidity of priests, the wickedness of judges, and the vices of men in authority.

The *judges* of his day, George Fox thus addressed—

"Mind the laws of God in the scriptures, and the spirit that gave them forth, and let them be your rule in executing judgment: and shew mercy, that you may receive mercy from God, the judge of all. And take heed of *gifts* and *rewards*, and of pride; for God doth forbid them, and they do all blind the eyes of the wise."—*Sewell*, p. 40.

Concerning the *priests*, he declared that

"Christ spake against the works of the world, and against the priests, and scribes, and pharisees, and their hypocritical profession. He that is a stranger to Christ, is an *hireling;* but the servants of Jesus Christ are free men. The *false teachers* always laid burdens upon the people, and the true servants of the Lord did speak against them. Jeremiah did speak against *hirelings*, and said it was an *horrible thing;* and said, What will ye do in the end? for the people and priests were given to covetousness! Thus pride is kept up, and that honour and mastership which Christ denied, and all unrighteousness. Yet multitudes of teachers—heaps of teachers—the golden cup full of abominations! *Paul did not preach for wages, but laboured with his hands, that he might be an example to all them that follow him.* O people, see who follow Paul! The prophet Jeremiah said, the prophets prophesy falsely, and the priests bear rule by their means; but now the priests bear rule by the means they get from the people: *take away* their means, and they will bear rule over you no longer!"—P. 42.

On one occasion, when invited by the priest to go into *the church*, he stood up in the "*steeple-house yard*," and declared—

"That he came not to hold up their *idol temples*, nor their *priests*, nor their *tithes*, nor their *Jewish* and *heathen* ceremonies. That the ground on which these their temples stood, was no more holy than any other piece of ground. That the apostles going into the Jews' synagogues and temple, was to bring people off from that temple, and from the offerings, and tithes, and *covetous priests* of that time. Moreover, that they ought to leave all their superstitious ceremonies, traditions, and doctrines of men;

and not regard such teachers of the world, that took *tithes*, and *great wages*, preaching for *hire*, *and divining for money*, whom God and Christ never sent."—P. 47.

When Cromwell proclaimed a day of *solemn fasting and humiliation*, George Fox addressed a paper "to the heads "and governors of the nation," in which he declared—

"This is not the fast that the Lord requires; to bow down the head like a bulrush for a day, and the day following to be in the same condition as they were before. To the light of Christ in your consciences, do I speak, which testifieth for God every day, and witnesses against all sin and persecution: which measure of God, if ye be guided by it, doth not limit God to a day, but leads to the fast which the Lord requires; which is, '*to loose the bonds of wickedness, to undo the heavy burthens, to break every yoke, and to let the oppressed go free.*'" Isa. lviii. 67.—*Ibid*, p. 181.

To Charles II. Barclay in the dedication of his apology for the Quakers, to that monarch, says—

"Thou hast tasted of prosperity and adversity; thou knowest what it is to be banished thy native country; to be overruled, as well as to rule and sit upon a throne; and being oppressed, thou hast reason to know how *hateful the oppressor* is, both to God and man. If after all these warnings and advertisements, thou dost not turn unto the Lord with all thy heart, but forget him who remembered thee in thy distress, and give up thyself to follow *lust and vanity*, surely great will be thy condemnation!"

Such were the breathings of the spirit in the primitive age of Quakerism; but alas! how silent, or how subdued, has that spirit now become. Against public abuses, against the crimes of the clergy, against the vices of kings, the mouths of the Quakers are now for ever closed, and they have become "*as dumb dogs that cannot bark.*" To what cause shall we attribute this striking change? Was the spirit by which it is said the primitive Quakers were moved, in error; and does it now dictate a more *loyal feeling*, and a greater attachment to *things as they are?* Have the authorities and the institutions of the land become more pure, or are the Quakers less honest? Both of these may, in some measure, prove to be the truth. Justice is, perhaps, more purely administered; toleration is more widely extended; a fanatical priesthood no longer usurps the authority of the establishment: but still *all* is not purity and holiness; there remains *yet* some little defects to be corrected, before the nation shall have become subdued to the authority of Christ, and the simplicity of the gospel. The *steeple-houses* yet remain, and indeed five hundred thousand pounds is about to be

voted to increase their number; the spiritual hirelings remain; the tithes remain; the Jewish and Heathen ceremonies remain; superstitious customs, and traditions and doctrines of men remain; and the mummery of public fasts is still resorted to. We have seen Barclay declaring to Charles, how *hateful is the oppressor*, both to God and man; and cautioning him not to give himself up to *lust and vanity*. However inappropriate such warning might be to his present Majesty, still we confess, there have been occasions even in the present reign, in which it would have been neither inconsistent, nor unworthy of the former spirit of Quakerism, to approach the throne in the language of admonition and of truth; and we do think, that a warning voice from the English Quakers to his Majesty, on occasion of the prosecution of the *late Queen*, would have been quite as worthy the former principles of the body, as was the *loyal address* that was so soon after presented by the Quakers of *Ireland*, on occasion of the royal visit to that country. Yes! when in that eventful trial, the laws of justice and of God were equally in danger of being violated—when it was solemnly proclaimed under the authority of a mitre, that "*the King* "*can do no wrong!*" we do think, that had the Quakers in an address to his Majesty, warned him against his evil advisers—had they declared the scripture law of divorce, by reference to the express authority of Jesus, they would at least have given a practical illustration of the sincerity of the prayer of the Irish Quakers, who, in their address to his Majesty, so soon after this event, raise their aspirations to the throne of heaven on his behalf:—

"May he influence thy heart to seek his Divine counsel in all thy steps, and grant thee his holy aid to perform the various great and important duties of thy high station; so that, being enabled to *rule in righteousness*, thou mayest in the end, *exchange thy earthly crown for an incorruptible crown of glory*." *

When also her Majesty, who, as was admitted, had, for no crime, lost the protection of her lawful husband, and after a long continuance in a foreign land, came over to this country, as Queen of England, to claim her rights and confront her accusers:—when, to speak in

* Address from the Friends in Ireland to George IV., signed at the yearly meeting held in Dublin, 6th day, 5th month, 1820.

the language of scripture, the Quakers saw that "*all her "friends have dealt treacherously with her; they have become "her enemies,*" an address of condolence to the Queen would have been as fitting the benevolence and loyalty of the Quakers, as was their address of congratulation to the King, on his accession to the throne. Their prayers might have been as consoling to the Queen, as they were held to be necessary to the King, to whom they will be found, on that occasion, thus to have addressed themselves:—

"And mayest thou, our king, living in the Divine fear, be prepared in the mercy of God in Christ Jesus our Lord, and through faith in the efficacy of his saving power, for a final inheritance among *purified spirits* in the realms of eternal bliss!!!" *

It may perhaps be said, that the Friends, generally, were adverse to the prosecution of the Queen, and we believe it; but so much the greater then is their condemnation, in not manifesting their sentiments by any public act. We pardon the prejudices of those who, from a blind attachment to power, and from a belief of her Majesty's guilt, justified an inquiry into her conduct:—we despise the prudence of those, who believing her innocent, raised no voice in her defence! But the truth is, the Quakers as a body, however estimable may be many individuals among them, have long since prostrated themselves to the footstool of corrupt power: affecting a disdain for the honours, the distinctions, and the vanities of this world, they are the first to flatter and to follow those who value these, and possess them in the highest degree. How strongly was this evinced, in the anxiety of the Quakers to introduce themselves to the European monarchs, in the year 1814, when on a visit to this country. The pretext, to be sure, was the suppression of the slave trade. The King of Prussia, it seems, rejected their advances; but Alexander, with better policy, tolerated their sycophancy; he attended their religious meetings, and admitted some of their leaders

---

* Address of the Quakers to George IV. on his accession to the throne; presented 3d day, 5th month, at Carlton Palace, by

Joseph Foster,	*Richard Phillips,*
Thomas Howard,	*John Coleby,*
William Foster,	*Luke Howard,*
John Fell,	*John Eliot,*
Josiah Messer,	*Josiah Forster,*
Samuel Gurney,	*Jacob Hagen.*

to the honour of a private conference. The character and policy of Alexander, are sufficiently known. His accession to a blood-stained throne, his oppression of the unhappy Poles, his efforts to re-establish popery and the inquisition in Spain, are all matters of history; and yet, would the reader have suspected that the Emperor Alexander was all this time, *a Quaker?* For this, or something very like this, he must believe, if he place confidence in the judgment of individuals of first consequence among the Friends, being indeed approved ministers of the body:—these are, *John Wilkinson, of High Wycombe; Stephen Grellett, of New York; and William Allen, of Plough-court, Lombard Street;* who were admitted to the honour of a private interview with the Emperor Alexander: a correct report of which interview was contained in a private letter from *John Wilkinson* to *Thomas Clarkson*, which came before the public in 1821:* from which report we make the following extracts.

The deputation, it appears, first presented to the Emperor some of the works of Barclay and Penn.

"After he had accepted the books, he turned towards us, and expressed himself with great kindness, and in very full terms, concerning the *satisfaction he felt at having been at the meeting*, and wished to know whether it was held in the same way as our meetings usually are. He was informed that it was; but that there is not always speaking in our meetings.

'Do you then,' said he, 'read the scriptures in them?'

'We are not in that practice; because we believe true worship to consist in the prostration of the soul before God, and we do not consider it necessary for any thing to be read or spoken, to produce that effect.'

'*This is my opinion also*,' replied the Emperor.

'And with regard to prayer, have you any form of prayer?'

'We have not; because we believe, that in prayer the soul must communicate its supplications in such a manner as best suits its condition at the time prayer is offered up.'

'*In that*,' replied the Emperor, '*I fully agree with you*,' &c. &c.

With regard to the *operation of the Divine Spirit on the mind*, he expressed himself in such a manner as one cannot conceive any thing short of his being *an humble and faithful follower of its holy and secret guidance!!!*"

Stephen Grellett also, represents the Emperor as saying—

"*I am one with you in sentiment* respecting the *spirituality* of your worship. I wish to pray not in form, but as I am assisted by the *Divine principle in my own heart.*"

So well did the Emperor act his part at this interview,

* Monthly Repository, vol. xvi. p. 701-2.

that the effect on Wilkinson's nerves was such as a beatific vision might be supposed to produce. Such is the "Divinity "that doth hedge round a king," that the poor man seems to have been actually king-stricken. "For many days" (says he) "I seemed as though I had been *exposed to a* "*blaze of light*, so powerfully was I impressed with the "*dignified*, yet *unaffected, humble*, and *pious countenance*, "manners, and expressions, of that *truly great prince*, "who seems, indeed, to be *walking in the light*, and to "be FILLED WITH THE LOVE OF TRUTH AND GOODNESS!" —Poland! Italy! Spain! Exiles of Europe! Victims of the Inquisition, whether wasting at the galleys, or pining in the dungeons!—raise your dejected spirits, and admire with the pious and benevolent Quakers, "*the love of truth* "*and goodness*" in him, whose policy has destroyed your liberties, your rights, and your hopes!

By no single act in the present day, have the Quakers, as a body, proved themselves to be the friends of the liberties, even of their own country, or of the rights of conscience. Even Lord Sidmouth's Bill, in 1811, which was aimed expressly at the rights of Protestant dissenters, and which united all classes of dissenters against its iniquitous provisions, insomuch that the table and floor of the House of Lords were literally covered with petitions—even this unwise and wicked measure received no opposition from the Quakers; they alone, of all the bodies of dissenters in the country, remained inactive, and preserved a cold and suspicious silence: although, indeed, when the battle was won, we were called upon to believe that the Friends, generally, participated in the pleasures of that triumph, which they stirred not a finger to produce!

It will still be said, that if the Quakers have lost their early independence together with their early fanaticism, they are still an active, useful, and benevolent class, as is evinced by their efforts to suppress the slave trade, to promote the distribution of the Bible, and to reform our prisons. Into the motives and merits of their efforts in these particulars, we shall inquire in our next: previous to which, and having now arrived at that stage of the inquiry in which we purposed to do so,* we submit to the reader, the defence of Mrs. Fry, to which we beg his special attention. We do not notice the tirade of low and unworthy invective which

* Vol. I. p. 389.

the champion of Mrs. Fry has recently directed against us, for not inserting his defence at an earlier period, any further than to assure him, that presenting, as that defence does, so many materials for the complete establishment of our avowed opinions concerning this lady, it would have been peculiarly gratifying to us to have done so, had it upon reflection have appeared to us in any way compatible with our main design—an examination of QUAKERISM.

DEFENCE OF MRS. FRY.

(FROM A CORRESPONDENT.)

To the Editor of the Freethinking Christians' Quarterly Register.

SIR,—As a disinterested, and as I hope unprejudiced, observer of religious sects and opinions, I have frequently remarked the inconsistency and absurdity of the doctrines that obtain in the present day, and from which it is almost considered a species of impiety to express dissent. Lamenting (mentally) the prejudice and the blindness of men upon religious subjects, who, upon all other subjects, have clear, correct, and even enlarged views; I have still generally avoided entering upon religious topics in conversation, lest the striking contrariety of opinion that would be manifested might prove fatal to the harmony it is so desirable to preserve, especially in mixed companies.

Knowing, however, your liberal and, generally speaking, correct views upon religious subjects, I felt gratified with the idea of your publishing your opinions, as I was tempted to consider your promised Register as a powerful means of hastening the desirable event, when error shall disappear and truth and rational religion be established; not that I profess myself an advocate of all your religious opinions, but because I thought that the very discussion of the subjects, upon which you would most probably employ your lucubrations, would, if not necessarily, at least incidentally, elicit truth; an object that would derive, in its development, considerable assistance from your well-known industry and talent.

As religion and politics have been connected by the government of our country, I was satisfied they neither could nor would be separated in your argumentative miscellany; and that, while you successfully opposed the domination of priests and priestcraft, you might effect not a little for political liberty. Two of your numbers have

now appeared; and I do not say that I feel disappointed in the expectations I had formed in this respect. I wish, however, to guard you against an error common to almost all reformers, and that error is *indiscrimination;* in plucking up the tares you have injured, not to say uprooted, the *wheat;* in the heat of pursuit, the fervour and phrenzy of your indignation at duplicity and inconsistency, you have blended foul and fair, good and evil; you have reserved even for the laborious yet silent and unassuming endeavours of virtuous women, the most biting passages of your sarcasm, and the utmost gall of your pen.

We will lay out of our consideration any question of gallantry that might seem to involve itself in this merciless visitation of your wrath upon the other sex. I am not disposed to consider error venial because of the sex or condition of those committing it, any more than I am disposed to suffer the imputation of such error to attach unjustly to the character of any one; I am content even that the public conduct of the females in question should be examined with the rigidity, and almost boasted absence of courtesy, peculiar to your sect, and knowing what I do of those females, of the services they have performed, and of the motives that impelled them, I fear nothing from the result of such examination.

You declare in the outset that "*all their works they do to be seen* "*of men.*" I deny the imputation, and in precisely the same terms; so that we are at once at issue upon the general question. Let us proceed to examine the description of argument by which you attempt to bolster up this sweeping proposition. As the *onus probendi* is with *you* it would be an act of supererogation in me to do more than to shew that you have failed in your proofs, and that your argument is inconclusive. It is possible, however, that I may bestow a word or two in praise of those whom you have so unsparingly condemned.

The females alluded to, you describe as "busy, bustling, bountiful "ladies, full of pride and piety, with much leisure and little diffidence; "so regular a set, and so much of a class, as to have the appearance "of being supplied by contract to the meeting." I proceed in diligent search for the argument in proof of what is here advanced, and in proof also of your original proposition, viz. "*That all their works* "*they do to be seen of men,*" and I find it in the following passage—"At the head of this holy sisterhood stands Mrs. Fry, and though "one of the sect of Quakers, a sect who affect to disregard the "praise of this world, *yet it does so happen* that the benevolent "efforts and unceasing labours of this good lady for the public cause "*are* noised abroad in the world, and even the senate resounds with "her praises."

I confess to you my disappointment, and with it my ready and deep-seated indignation, when I read, for the first time, the passage I have quoted; carrying along with me, as I did, the motto of your article, viz. "*That all their works they do to be seen of men.*" I naturally looked for some overt act on the part of Elizabeth Fry,

some unequivocal demand of popular attention and applause, or, at least, something to which an envious ingenuity might, without any very forced construction, appear to indicate a thirst of praise; judge, then of my surprise when the strong evidence I was waiting for dwindled and was diluted into the pusillanimous sneer of "*it does* "*so happen* that her benevolent efforts are noised abroad in the "world." It was incumbent upon you to shew, if you intended to sustain your proposition, and support thereby the imputation you had cast upon this distinguished female, not that the world had *seen* her philanthropic endeavours, but that she had (like the pharisees to whom the expression alluded to was originally applied) *obtruded* those endeavours on the public gaze; that she had *sought* to be complimented in that senate which as you say, (and justly) resounded with her praises; that, forsaking the precepts of that Master whom she professed to serve, and undervaluing, or entirely disregarding, the legitimate reward of virtue—viz. the internal satisfaction that it affords—she had evinced a regard and value only for the unsubstantial praise of the world. You have not done this, and for the best of all reasons, because you could not do it; and, having failed in this respect, all the scurrilous declamation, in which you impute what you cannot prove, is to be regarded only as the distempered breath of hatred or of envy.

If the object of Elizabeth Fry had been the praise of the world, or if she had designed merely to draw public attention from motives of vanity, I can conceive a variety of ways in which she might have so done more agreeable, I might have said less revolting to the natural disposition, than that which she has chosen; and, if her object had been the gratification of personal vanity, she would doubtless have sought to gratify that vanity at the least possible sacrifice of her exertions: she appears to me, on the contrary, to have sought, not the most easy, but the most arduous task that presented itself to view; one, too, that it is more than probable, would have called forth the displeasure, rather than the approbation, of the government and the senate, as implying, towards both, a silent yet cutting rebuke upon their own inattention and criminal supineness in a work that properly belonged to them—a work calculated only to stir in them feelings of jealousy and self-reproach, that the functions they had neglected to exercise should be usurped by an isolated individual, and that individual a *woman*.

Whilst attempting to support your assertion—that "*all their* "*works they do to be seen of men*"—it does appear strange and unaccountable to me that you should quote the speech of a distinguished statesman and orator who, in his almost inspired periods, gives a gratuitous and unqualified denial of this imputation; who, without any possible motive—except the exalted one, that induces a man to stop on his way to render homage to virtue, adds the whole weight of his name and character to the very converse of the proposition, by saying, "their equanimity was incapable of being

"disturbed by vanity." The ladies who accompanied Sir James Macintosh to the prison of Newgate are represented, also, as bearing witness to the "*calm good sense*" that distinguished the female committee. It is yourselves only that bear a contrary testimony; and *that* without having availed yourselves of the opportunities of making observations.

You affect to consider the active philanthrophy of the female committee as infringing upon the retiredness of female habits, as inducing a desertion of those hearths of which that sex are the solace and the joy: the description you have drawn of the duties of a female includes that of casting upon her lord "the burden of com-"merce with the world." You are right in the general sentiment; though you are wrong in the application you have made of it in this particular instance. The "commerce with the world," as you are pleased to call it, with which Elizabeth Fry and the committee are chargeable, is a description of commerce *in which men cannot engage;* there would be an evident impropriety, I will go further and say an evident impossibility in our sex attempting, what is both attempted and performed by these females; to effect the reform contemplated by the committee it is necessary to go to the root and origin of the vice; to learn the history of the criminal; to mark by what gradual steps that criminal proceeded from misfortune to error, from error to crime; to note how often a female criminal has been made such by the crimes of our sex; to hear, in fact, that secret history that will not be told to a man: how, therefore, the reform alluded to could be cast upon us *lords* with any advantage to the cause, or, indeed, with any likelihood of our discharging the duties that are now so effectually discharged by the females, I am at a loss to imagine.

You cannot conceive how the female duties can be performed while the attention is distracted by "complicated schemes of public "reformation." I will inform you, though you cannot conceive it, that, from my own personal knowledge, those duties are performed, and, perhaps, more effectually than is generally the case, even in instances where there is nothing but such duties to engage the attention, by the more than common activity and industry exemplified by these females. The description of reformation in which they are engaged, instead of being complicated, is the most simple that can be imagined; consisting in instructing the prisoners to work, at the same time furnishing them with the means, enforcing habits of regularity and of cleanliness, and reading and expounding religious works; there is nothing in all this to distract the brain, or to lead the mind out of the track of the common pursuits and concerns of life; on the contrary, the tendency of enforcing habits of order and clealiness in others, will be to fix more deeply those habits in themselves, and in their families.

I will just notice a proof of the spirit in which your animadversions on others are penned—the extreme littleness or malignity of mind

it could induce you to allude in the manner you have done to the sband of Elizabeth Fry. No one you say dreams of *Mister* Fry— shame upon men who stand forward as public reformers, both in litics and religion; shame upon the avowed advocates of the unaltered religion of Jesus, to stop thus in the middle of an argument to insult the husband of a woman whom you are disposed to sure! I could not have believed it possible that men of talent, e yourselves, (and I freely acknowledge you superior to most men this respect) could have descended so "vilely low."

In conclusion, I would ask of the writers in the Quarterly Register abate nothing of their zeal against the multifarous errors of opinion th in religion and politics that, even at the present day, are so dely spread, and so deeply rooted in society; I would wish them abate nothing of that fearlessness with which they have hitherto ken and written on public delinquences: but I do call upon them spare the little that is good amongst us, to discriminate and to e thereby to their public censures a value and consistency.

J. F.

May 5, 1823.

The subject of Quakerism, including a reply to the above, to be ntinued in our next.

THE YEAR.

(Continued from Vol. i. p. 319.)

When prophets saw or poets feigned a fall,
'Twas of an angel from the throne of heaven
Recoiling headlong down. So deep, so low,
So abject, so despised, so base *his* fall—
The Apostate's—who, from Truth's high summit hurled,
Sinks' midst the clouds of anger and of pride,
And, in the pit of mental darkness lost,
Gnashes his teeth, reviling. Folly's sons,
Light Pleasure's idle votaries, Passion's slaves,
These have their sorrows and their chastisement,
But no bright beam of former glory shines
To cast reflected shadows on *their* gloom;
No—cruel self-reproach, with barbed tooth,
Brings rankling recollections of the past
To urge their present madness to despair.
They are but what they *have* been; and their lot
Is of one tissue. Darker far his doom

(To all the strongest ties of honour lost)
Whose hand is raised to strike, what once it reared;
Whose tongue is turned to curse, what once it blessed;
Whose heart is bent to scoff, what once it loved—
And still reveres—but scoffs and curses still!
Once to have known, and, having known, to prize
The holy gift of truth:—have tasted once
God's word in power and wisdom, then to fall
Weakly and vilely; turning renegade
Against all conscience of his sacred will,
All just obedience to his sovereign law;
And, for some selfish, base, ignoble, end,
Some baffled purpose, or indignant aim—
For passion—wrath or pride—to sell the pearl,
The costly pearl of wisdom; and return,
Like the brute beast, to wallow in the mire
Of his first ignorance;—then adder like
(To God apostate—and to man ingrate)
To sting a benefactor, or to seek
His hurt, whose crime was but to raise the wretch
From want, who now reviles him. To pursue
With restless malice and unslaked revenge,
(The venom of a wrathful, cankered heart)
All who with silent scorn behold his course,
Or pass him as an unregarded thing.
Only to live, to hate;—when Death himself,
With all his woes and terrors, has passed near,
Reckless to steal a pinion from his wing,
With which to write the record of his wrath—
Such the Apostate is! Mad passion reigns
(Fit retribution) in his care-worn heart;
And the man wanders—as in *Eblis'* hall
The spectre-like inhabitants;—some wild,
Some deadly calm; a hand upon each heart,
And underneath the hand that pressed each heart
Glowed fire! Go view him in the paths of life,
Pursue him to his closet; vain to him
Is all the world calls joy; vain its applause;
And worse than vain its riches and rewards.
These cannot give—what only truth can give—
Peace—self-esteem. He turns within, and feels

No succour there—no refuge—no support.
Amid the warfare of the world he flies
To his own heart—and finds a traitor there!
Conceit itself, too weak to prop him up.
Before his idol—vanity, men bend
With incense of false praise—*he* knows it all
Mock worship and a cheat—himself despised,
And hated by himself. Go, view the man
There, where all men are known, *at home;* no love,
No reverence marks his presence—no esteem,
Than orient offerings richer! The free gifts
Which the fond subjects of a father's sway
Before his throne in rich profusion bring.
Traitor—apostate from the paths of truth;
He canot teach her lessons; should his lips
But idly prate her dictates, his vain life,
The present and the past compared, would rise,
And his own children would convict the man,
And shame him into silence. No fond gaze,
With unquenched confidence, can meet his glance,
Deeming *him* true—who to himself, his friends,
And e'en to heaven is false. The world alone,
The vain, the empty, the ungrateful world,
Receive him as a brother; but still hold
His friendship with distrust, as one who once
Pretended to a higher race, and held
A holier communion. Still he lives,
And mixes with that world; nay, strikes his root,
And, like the bay tree, spreads his verdant boughs
Luxuriant, and the summer showers of heaven
Fall on each spreading branch. The psalmist once
Sang such a tree—he passed, and it was not.

Who shall th' Apostate's latter days record?
Perhaps there yet is mercy—e'en for him.
Some sun-beam may yet strike his darkened sense,
And wake him to new light; affliction's cup
May yet pour blessings; sad adversity
May soften still his barrenness of heart,
Rise, like the dews, to fall again in showers.
Vain hope! he rather, having lived in hate,
May die in stubbornness; his conscience seared,

And his heart hardened; like the stiff-necked race
Of Egypt, when they blindly trod the depths
Of the returning sea, he, deaf to thought,
May plunge amid the billows of the grave;
And to the parting pang of life may bear
The sword of fury, wear the mask of pride;
Or, should he see his madness, maniac like,
(Whom reason visits on the verge of life)
Cast one repentent look with terror back,
Then, hopeless, sink in an unhonoured tomb.

(To be continued.)

ON RELIGIOUS WORSHIP.—Essay VI.

THE SINGING OF THE LEVITES.

"What is man?
Where must he find his maker? with what rites
Adore him? Will he hear, accept, and bless?
Or does he sit regardless of his works?
—'Tis Revelation satisfies all doubts."—*Cowper's Task, Book II.*

In pursuing the question, whether or not public social prayer was practised by the Jewish people, we had in our last number, commenced an examination of the temple worship. In that essay, we examined, *firstly*, the offerings and sacrifices made by the priests, or ministers of state. In our present essay, we have, *secondly*, to inquire respecting the hymns of praise and thanksgiving sung by the levites or courtiers.—See p. 55. Such hymns or songs of praise, having been, either ignorantly or intentionally, by many writers, confounded with and adduced as a precedent for the practice of social prayer, it will be our present business to shew, that the levites were appointed to certain special offices, as part of the political and religious government of the Jews; that their singing in the temple formed one of their offices; that their songs consisted of praise or thanksgiving, *not of petition or prayer*; that they were not offered

up socially with the people, *but by the levites only*, as a part of their peculiar office; and that the practice of offering up such praise at all, having arisen out of peculiar circumstances, and having been practised in conformity with an especial ordinance, it cannot be a precedent for us, or indeed, for any other people, in any other age, who are *not* placed in such circumstances, and to whom such an ordinance has *not* been given.

We established in our former essay, that "Jehovah was the "king as well as the God of Israel; and that the PRIESTS "AND LEVITES, who were the immediate and stated attendants on his presence in the royal tent or palace, (as the "tabernacle or temple may be stiled) and to whom the execution of the law was in many cases committed, WERE "PROPERLY MINISTERS OF STATE AND OF CIVIL GOVERNMENT, AS WELL AS OF RELIGION."

That part of the subject which we are now examining, calls upon us to direct our attention more especially to the levites. These were a large body of men; their offices were various, and their employments different in different ages, and under a change of circumstances. Our present business, indeed, is more immediately with that portion of the body, which, after the establishment of the temple, was employed in singing hymns of praise and thanksgiving to the God and King of the Jewish people. Their origin, and their *general* employment, we shall, however, briefly bring before the reader, for the purpose of shewing, that their existence as a body, and the various duties which they had to perform, were *all* (the duty of singing among the rest) in connection with the belief of the Jews in the peculiar presence of Jehovah; that such services were paid to him, as their king or ruler as well as their God: in short, that these were political duties, which the levites officially performed *as ministers of state and of civil government*; in which they were not *then* socially joined by the Jewish people, and in which they cannot *now* be imitated by any nation, or by the self-named priesthood of any nation, who stand in *no* such political relation to Deity, and who are *not* appointed by him, or acknowledged by him, as a peculiar people.

We have first then, with this view, to examine the origin and *general* duties of the body of men called levites, preparatory to an inquiry into a particular practice which devolved upon them—that of singing the praise of Jehovah in the Jewish temple.

The levites are generally known as being attendants on the temple service, and are considered as a lower order of priests or ecclesiastical officers. They have been regarded as parallel with the order of deacons in the Christian church. Thus *Godwyn* commences his chapter on the temple officers, as follows: "There were three ranks or degrees of ministers "about the temple—priests, LEVITES, and nethinims: they "may be paralleled with ministers, DEACONS, and sub-"deacons, in the primitive church."* The fallacy of this view will be seen at once, when it is remembered, that the levites formed one whole tribe, or the twelfth part of the children of Israel. They were the whole posterity of Levi, the third son of Jacob, with the exception only of the family of Aaron, which was set apart to the higher dignity of being the priests, or more immediate attendants on the court of Jehovah. (See 1 Chron. xxiii. 13, and p. 54, of this volume.) The origin of the setting apart of the whole tribe of Levi, is worthy of remark.—The circumstance stands closely connected with that chain of events which gave rise to the *political* connection, if it may be so called, which subsisted between Jehovah and the Jewish people. All the first-born of the Egyptians having been miraculously destroyed, when the first-born of the Israelites were spared, in order to preserve the memory of the miracles, and of that great deliverance from their bondage in Egypt, which it occasioned, the Deity was pleased to appoint, that in future, all the first-born males should be "*set apart unto the Lord.*" In lieu, however, of the first-born of *all* the tribes, the whole tribe of Levi was afterwards accepted, an estimate having been made of the number of each; and the first-born being found somewhat to exceed in number the levites, a compensation in money, for the use of the sanctuary, was made for the difference. (See Exod. xii. 29. xiii. 12.; Numb. iii. 14. 45. viii. 17.) From this time, the tribe of Levi became peculiarly the servants of Jehovah, being *properly ministers of state and of civil government, as well as of religion.* Their numbers were considerable. When first appointed through Moses, they consisted of "*twenty and two thousand.*" (Numb. iii. 39.) Those above thirty years of age, had, in the time of David, increased to thirty-eight thousand. (1 Chron. xxiii. 3.) Their employments were necessarily different at different times, and various at all times; but (what is the

* Godwyn's Moses and Aaron, Lib. I. chap. 5.

point to which we chiefly wish the attention of the reader directed) the *whole* of these employments, whether in or out of the temple, arose out of the peculiar relation in which they stood, as the chosen servants or ministers of the monarch. Set apart for the service of the state, and under the direction of an allwise and beneficent Ruler, the whole of their duties and employments appear to have been directed (contrary to the principles of but too many governments, ancient and modern) to the well-being of the governed. Their several employments, independent of their duties in the temple, have been thus described by Lewis:—

"Many of them were employed in civil affairs, and were public officers in the commonwealth. They presided in the courts of justice in the several cities, when the courses of their ministry were over; for they came in and went out by set numbers every week, in twenty-four courses, and appeared at the temple but once in four and twenty weeks, unless at the three grand solemnities. This recess gave them opportunity to instruct the people in the mosaic law; to expound the moral, the ceremonial, and judicial parts of it; and to judge in matters of controversy that were brought before them. Josephus reckons the number of the levites of this kind, with their scribes, as he calls them, to be six thousand; from whence it appears, that the sect of the scribes belonged to the judges. The public records and genealogies were preserved by these levites; they were the lawyers and recorders; to them belonged the administration of justice, the exposition of the laws, the writing out of the copies of the holy books for the use of the synagogues in the country, the preservation of the lineage of their tribes, the laying the rolls of the records in relation to things sacred and civil, (that concerned either the king or the people) so that persons of the greatest rank and quality were of the levitical tribe. We find them to be chief judges of the land, generals of the army, and councillors of state to the king. They were the principal advancers of learning and knowledge: they excelled in all the arts and sciences of those ages, the schools of the prophets, and the universities of the land, being under their government and institution."—*Jewish Antiquities*, vol. i. p. 180.

Here we see clearly stated, the *political* objects for which the tribe of Levi was set apart. A few references will at once illustrate and confirm this view of the subject.—"*At "that time the Lord separated the tribe of Levi, to bear the "ark of the covenant of the Lord, to stand before the Lord, "to minister unto him, and to bless in his name. Wherefore "Levi hath no part nor inheritance with his brethren; THE "LORD IS HIS INHERITANCE, according as the Lord thy "God promised him.*" (Deut. x. 8, 9.) The 26th chapter of 1 Chronicles, describes the employment of several of this body; verses 20—28 describe the appointment of many to the office of treasurers of spoils won in battle, &c.; verse 29, names those who were "*for the outward business over Israel,*

"*for officers and judges.*" (See also 1 Chron. xxiii. 4.) For the nature of the situations here described under the names of officers and judges, (in the original, *shoterim* and *shophetrim*) the reader may consult Jenning's Jewish Antiquities, Book I. chap. 1. and 5. The former of these, Dr. Patrick conjectures, were men of great authority, whom the Jewish targum calls governors, who, like our justices of the peace, saw good order kept, and the laws observed; whilst the latter, were the superior magistrates or governors, whose province it was, to decide in the courts of law. (See 2 Chron. xix. 8.) Thus also, certain of the tribe of Levi are described as "*employed in all the business of the Lord, and in the service of the king,*" (1 Chron. xxvi. 30.) and as being made rulers, "*for every matter pertaining to God, and the affairs of the king.*" (Verse 32.) Here we find them forming a part, and an essential part of the government of their country. They were, from the same cause, as Lewis calls them, "*lawyers and recorders,*" the expounders and teachers of the written, or what we should call, the statute law of the land. To illustrate their employment in this respect, an interval of anarchy and idolatry in the Jewish history, is thus described: (2 Chron. xv. 3, 5.) "*Now for a long season Israel hath been without the true God, and without a teaching priest, (or minister) and without law.*"—"*And there was no peace to him that went out, nor to him that came in.*" In a succeeding reign, when, in order to correct these evils, the book of the law is sent to the princes, and throughout the cities of Judah, to instruct the people, it is to the hands of TEN LEVITES and two priests, that the task is entrusted. (2 Chron. xvii. 8.) On the return from the Babylonish captivity, upon the LEVITES it is that devolved the task of "*causing the people to understand the law.*" (Neh. viii. 7.) "*So they*" (we are told, that is, the levites) "*read in the book in the law of God distinctly, and gave the sense, and caused the people to understand the reading.*"

We have hitherto been looking at what may, in point of worldly dignity at least, be called the superior offices and employments of the tribe of Levi: we have first taken these, as best illustrative of the causes and objects of their appointment. The great mass of them were, however, necessarily employed in offices of a more laborious, though, all the circumstances considered, not less honourable description. We have incidentally recorded the numbers of this tribe in the time of David, when toward the end of his reign, he was preparing for the erection of the temple. "*Now*

" *the levites were numbered from the age of thirty years* " *and upward: and their number by their polls, man by man,* " *was thirty and eight thousand. Of which, twenty and four* " *thousand were to set forward the work of the house of the* " *Lord; and six thousand were officers and judges. Moreover,* " *four thousand were porters, and four thousand praised the* " *Lord with the instruments which I made* (said David) *to* " *praise therewith.*"

That class of the duties of the levites which was peculiarly connected with the tabernacle and the temple, and with the worship of each, varied according to times and circumstances. Their office was generally " *to wait on the sons of* " *Aaron, for the service of the house of the Lord;*" they were " *appointed unto all manner of service of the tabernacle.*" (1 Chron. vi. 48. xxiii. 28.) But *all* their service of this description, arose out of, and was directed with a view to, the belief in the peculiar presence of Jehovah, as king or ruler over the people of Israel. The levites were, in these employments, as in the others to which we have already adverted, " *properly ministers of state and of civil government, as* " *well as of religion;*" and the performance of these employments was regarded as an honourable and peculiar privilege. A great part of the tabernacle service assigned to them on their institution in the wilderness, was peculiar to the state of the Israelites at that time; namely, taking down the tabernacle, setting it up, and carrying it about as they removed from place to place. So peculiar was the situation of the levites regarded, that when Moses was commanded to number the children of Israel, (Numb. i. 2) he was expressly told, (verse 47) that " *the levites, after the tribe of* " *their fathers, were not to be numbered amongst them;*"— " *But*" (it is added) " *thou shalt appoint the levites over the* " *tabernacle of testimony, and over all the vessels thereof, and* " *over all things that belong to it: they shall bear the taber-* " *nacle, and all the vessels thereof, and they shall minister unto* " *it, and shall encamp round about the tabernacle. And when* " *the tabernacle setteth forward, the levites shall take it down;* " *and when the tabernacle is to be pitched, the levites shall set it* " *up: and the stranger that cometh nigh, shall be put to death.*" The peculiar devotion of the levites to the service of Jehovah, is strongly marked by this last prohibition; it is confirmed by the verses which follow.—" *And the children* " *of Israel shall pitch their tents every man by his own camp,* " *and every man by his own standard, throughout their hosts.* " *BUT THE LEVITES SHALL PITCH ROUND ABOUT THE* " *TABERNACLE OF TESTIMONY, that there be no wrath*

" *upon the congregation of the children of Israel: and the levites* " *shall keep the charge of the tabernacle of testimony.*"

Such was the employment, and such the separate character of the tribe of Levi, during the wandering of the children of Israel in the wilderness: when settled in the land of Canaan, and particularly after the erection of the temple, their employment about the ark of the covenant, which was now stationary, and in the presence of Jehovah, which was now held in the temple and its courts, was necessarily changed, " *Put the holy ark in the house which Solomon, the son of David,* " *king of Israel, did build; it shall not be a burthen upon your* " *shoulders: serve now the Lord your God, and his people Is-* " *rael.*" The levites who performed these offices—*political* offices, because they are expressly described as paid both to the king and *the people*, have been divided by some into two, but by others, with more of scriptural evidence in their favour, into three classes. " The first class, were to assist " the priests in the exercise of their ministry, to purify the " holy things, to prepare the shew bread, and flour, and " wine, and oil, for the sacrifice, and sometimes to kill " the sacrifice, when there was more work of that de- " scription than the priest could conveniently perform." (1 Chron. xxiii. 28. 2 Chron. xxix. 34. xxxv. 10.) " The " second class formed the temple choir; music, vocal " and instrumental, having been introduced into the cere- " monials practised in the court of Jehovah, by Moses in " the first instance, and afterwards confirmed and more fully " established, by David and Solomon."—" The third class, " were the porters, to whose charge the several gates of the " sanctuary were appointed by lot: (1 Chron. xxvi. 1, " xiii. 9. 2 Chron. xxxv. 15. viii. 14) their proper business " was to open and shut the gates, and to attend at them by " day, as a sort of peace officers, in order to prevent any tu- " mult among the people; to keep strangers and the ex- " communicated and unclean persons from entering into the " holy court; and, in short, to prevent whatever might be " prejudicial to the safety, peace, and purity, of the holy " place and service."

It is with the custom of singing hymns of praise and thanksgiving in the temple, by the levites, that we have chiefly, if not wholly, to do, in this inquiry; but so much of misunderstanding exists generally on this subject, and the singing of the levites has been so much perverted, for the purpose of affording an argument in favour of the modern practice of public social prayer and singing among the people, that we felt we could not successfully grapple with this part of the

subject, or fully establish the truth concerning it, without first taking a *general* view of the several duties performed by the levites, and of the peculiar relation in which they were regarded as standing, both to God and the people.

To the singing of the levites in the Jewish temple we have now, therefore, to turn our attention. That ceremony has, by some of the more strenuous advocates of public social prayer been adduced in support of the practice of modern times. Thus Mr. Moore, in his "Inquiry into the "Scriptural Authority for Social Worship," has a whole head or chapter entitled "*Music of the Temple Service;*" which chapter he concludes in the following words:—"From "all this then it is evident, that the whole services of the "temple, including prayer, and praises, which was practiced "there under divine sanction, constituted social worship.*

The inference here meant to be drawn is, that the modern practices of public social prayer and singing receive a sanction and support from the music and praises of the temple; it will now be our business to show that they receive *no* such support or sanction; that the cases are wholly and essentially different in their circumstances, and that the songs and praises of the levites were not prayers at all, but praises forming part of the external ceremonial of the temple, which was the court or palace of Jehovah, considered as the temporal ruler and political king of the Jewish people; and the authority for which of course ceased with the existence of that temple.

The use of music and singing by the levites, as the means of expressing national praise and gratitude to their king and ruler, arose naturally out of the feelings, and the practice of

---

* Of the head or chapter above referred to, as entitled "*Music of the* "*Temple Service*," it may be observed, that only *the two first*, out of the *seven* pages of which it is formed, refer to such music at all; and even these two pages are full of assertions without proof, and, what is even worse, without any connection being shewn, or even attempted, between the ceremonies of the Jewish temple and the practice of modern times. We have, from beginning to end, to make similar complaints of this work, which has been described in the Monthly Repository as "a judicious and "satisfactory argument for common or joint prayer." A weak cause cannot, we are aware, be supported by strong arguments; but we think common caution and common prudence, if he had not been actuated by higher motives, might have suggested to the editor of the work, above-mentioned, the propriety of speaking, at least in more measured terms of such a production as that of Mr. Moore. We have not in this subject confined ourselves to bare assertion; nor shall we do so in future; convincing proof will not be wanting in support of our opinion of this "*judi*-"*cious and satisfactory*" production.

that age and country. The manners of the East have always favoured the external expression of feeling, not only by pomp and ceremony, but by signs—by action—by shouting—by dancing—by music—and by songs. That such was the early practice of the Jewish people, both with regard to political and personal circumstances is evident from their history; as will be more fully shewn, when, in a future essay, we shall have occassion to notice such of their national songs as were *not* sung in the temple; the manners of the age and their peculiar religious views leading them to many habits in this respect quite inconsistant with modern habits and usage. Our present business is, however, strictly speaking, with the *temple* worship, and *that portion only* of their national songs, or anthems, which was sung before the ark, and in the presence of the Lord. Let us inquire then how it was that this practice of singing and praising in the temple became *especially* and *peculiarly* connected with, or incumbent upon a portion of the tribe of Levi. We have seen that the Jews considered themselves, as being the chosen people of God, regarding Jehovah as their king, as temporal governor; that they believed in the existence of a particular or especial providence which directed all the concerns of their nation —which aided their councils—guided their arms—formed their laws, and controuled their government. From the origin of their history as a nation, they had been in the habit of tracing up all to *Him*, who, when he delivered them from the Egyptians had "*born them on eagles' wings and* "*brought them unto himself*." The tabernacle, we have seen, was his tent in the wilderness; the temple was his palace in the city. The priests were his servants or courtiers; and, to come more immediately to our subject, the levites, who formed one of the twelve tribes, had been set apart, as we have seen in the early part of this Essay, for the especial purposes of his government. They were the servants of the king, for the good of the people; the instructors of the nation; the teachers and administrators of the law. From one of their families had been taken the priests or courtiers who stood in the immediate presence of the king. When wandering in the wilderness, it had devolved upon them to carry the ark or tent of Jehovah; and, finally, when the temple was built, a portion of them was appointed, as an especial honour and privilege, to sing in his presence. Let the reader bear in mind all these circumstances; let him consider the then prevailing manners, and customs—the practice of the Jews to express themselves in poetry, and song; to give vent to their feelings in shoutings

and acclamations, and music, and dancing, and singing,—let him bear in mind that all, or nearly all, these songs bore reference to the especial providence and peculiar presence of Jehovah;—to his government as king, his wisdom as lawgiver, and his justice as judge of the people; let him remember too that the levites were "*properly ministers of the state and of civil government*," and he will immediately see the causes which operated to make the levites, or a portion of them, "*singers in the courts of the Lord*;"—he will see that they obtained this high and distinguished privilege by virtue of their office—in consequence of the views then entertained by the Jewish people—as a part of the Mosaic covenant and Jewish ceremony; but he will also see that as their system of external rule and government on the part of the Deity has ceased with the destruction of the Jewish temple, and has been continued to no other people; so the singing of the levites must cease and leave no pretence whatever for others to imitate that extinct mode of paying reverence, which arose from peculiar circumstances alone, and which was offered to the king of the Jews as a part of the ceremonial of his court, and an external means of paying him national and political homage.

The singing of the levites is, however, without a view to any of these circumstances, adduced as an evidence in favour of public social prayer and singing, as practised in the present day, and, in order to make the cases parellel it is assumed or asserted, contrary to all scripture evidence, as well as to the nature of the case, that the people *joined* the levites by responses, or otherwise, in their songs of praise and thanksgiving in the temple.

"But it is the manner," (observes Mr. Moore, Inquiry, p. 55) "in which the singing was conducted that deserves the "chief attention, as proving indisputably the perfectly social "nature of this part of the service," "The singers" (says Lightfoot, ch. VII. § 2) "divided each of these psalms "into three parts, making a considerable pause at the end "of each part; and when the singing and musical instru-"ments stopped, in the intervals the trumpets sounded, "and the people worshipped." Thus far Lightfoot. But Mr. Moore carries the matter further, and adds "Not "by bowing the head only, BUT BY RESPONSES, thus ex-"pressing their participation and concurrence. This then "was clearly social worship; IT WAS CONDUCTED BY THE "LEVITES, AND THE PEOPLE JOINED IN IT THROUGH-"OUT."

Mr. Moore here, it will be seen, asserts that the worship of the people was *conducted* by the levites. Only eight pages back, in this same work, (p. 48) he admits that there "*might* "*be* NO MINISTERS OF THE TEMPLE WHOSE BUSINESS IT "WAS TO CONDUCT THE DEVOTIONS OF THE PEOPLE." To reply to a writer thus full of contradictions is extremely difficult. It may be observed, in the present case, that his assertion, that the people joined in the songs of the levites by responses, is wholly gratuitous, and without good authority, For this fact, indeed—*the only fact important to the argument*—he cites no authority whatever. Had he supported his assertion by Lightfoot, and a whole host of rabbinical writers, it would have been but little to his purpose, as we should have been enabled to disprove the fact by a reference to higher authority, at least as we regard it so, namely—the scriptures. Even if the Jewish people *had* joined the levites in the temple songs, it could be successfully shewn that this would form no defence of the modern practice; theirs being songs—not of prayer, or petition—but of praise and thanksgiving; and being besides *national* songs, having a political object, and being sung in the presence of their king. But the evidence of the scriptures is conclusive, that the levites were appointed *exclusively* to sing in the temple, as in the royal presence, and that the people did *not* socially join in such songs, either by responses, or otherwise. That portion of the tribe of Levi which aided in the temple service, had, as we have seen, three descriptions of employment. First, They assisted the priests in the sacrifices. Second, They sang the praises of the Lord, morning and evening, in their courses. Third, They were the porters, or door keepers, of the temple. It would be as consistent to suppose that the people joined them in the preparations for the sacrifices, and in keeping the doors, as that they did so in their songs of praises. The singing levites, in the time of David, amounted, as we have seen, to 4000; these afterwards were divided into twenty-four courses, or sets, who successively formed the temple choir. But why were they so numerous? Why were they confined to the temple? If they were not the choir themselves, but merely the "*conductors*" of the songs, or prayers, of the people, one or two would have sufficed for that purpose; and they should have been—not confined to the temple—but spread abroad throughout the land of Judea. This is, we see, the modern practice; the priest, or the parish clerk, *conducting* the prayers, or singing, of the people, and the whole body not

being assembled on one spot, but spread throughout the country;* whereas the levites were collected by courses in the temple, (the people being admitted only *to the courts* of the temple) and they then, on account of the peculiar presence, and by virtue of their exclusive office, as ministers of Jehovah, sang his praises, and offered up thanksgiving.

We shall now proceed to adduce from scripture some of the leading passages in which the duties of the levites, or that portion of them engaged in the singing of the temple, are spoken of, in order to shew that their singing in the presence of God was a privilege granted to them exclusively, as his courtiers or attendants, and that there is no evidence whatever to support the position that the people were allowed to join, by responses or otherwise, in their songs. To put the case as strong as possible, we shall, in the first place, take, not individual cases, in which the levites are described as singing, but some of those passages in which the levites receive a special and, as it appears to us, an exclusive appointment. Not that there was anything in these songs in which the people *could* not have joined, it being probable, in conformity with what is known as to their manners, that they, the people, did on special and important occasions (which will be noticed hereafter) express their rejoicings, &c. by songs to Jehovah, even when not assembled expressly for religious purposes; but what we are now intent on establishing is the fact merely that they *did* not join in the songs of the levites *in the temple*, and *that* in order to destroy the inference endeavoured to be raised in favour of social prayer and singing in *modern* temples, as they are called; that is, in churches and chapels.

Having "*no more to carry the tabernacle nor any vessels of "it, for the service thereof,*" (1 Chron. xxiii. 26) David "*spake to the chief of the levites to appoint their brethren "to be the singers with instruments of music, psalteries, and "harps, and cymbals, sounding, by lifting up the voice with "joy.*" (1 Chron. xv. 16.) Here the appointment was, that

* The Roman mass, and our cathedral service, affords, perhaps, the nearest approach to the singing of the Jewish temple; they were, indeed, borrowed from that, and the worship of paganism combined. They want, however, much of the splendour, more of the piety, and *all the authority* which attended the worship of the Jewish temple. The dissenters (Mr. Moore inclusive) come the worst off in this argument. Where are the levites and their songs to be discovered in the chapel at Somers Town, Hackney, or South Place, Finsbury?

they, the levites, should be the singers—*absolutely* and, we are justified by the language in inferring, *exclusively*—in conformity with what we have seen of their whole tribe being set apart to the service of Jehovah: at any rate, it is not said that they were to sing with the people, and still less is it said that they were to *conduct* the devotions of the people. In the next chapter (xvi. 4) we are told that "*David appointed certain of the levites to record, and* "*thank, and praise the Lord God of Israel.*" All this was in strict accordance with their office; it would not have been in accordance with that office, or in due *keeping* with their honourable station, as courtiers in the temple, that their praises should have been joined in by the people, who were only permitted to assemble in the outer courts. "*To stand every morning to thank and praise the Lord, and* "*likewise at even,*" is constantly spoken of as the peculiar duty, or privilege rather, of Asaph and his brethren; but not one word is said, at least in the scripture histories, of "*responses, by which the people expressed their participation* "*and concurrence.*" Such responses, on the part of the people, would appear to exist only in the legends of the rabbinical writers, or in the imagination of theorists, who wish to find ancient authority and example for their modern abuses on the subject of public social worship.

The appointment made by David was confirmed by his son Solomon—"*He appointed, according to the order of* "*David, his father, the courses of the priest to their service,* "*and the levites to their charges, to praise and minister* "*before the priests, as the duty of every day required; the* "*porters also by their courses at every gate.*" (2 Chron ix. 14.) Here the duty of those who sung, to *praise* and *minister*, is as absolute and exclusively confined to themselves as that of the porters who were to keep the gate. We cannot fairly collect that the people were to join in the one, any more than that they were to assist in the other.

If this may be fairly inferred from passages which speak generally of their appointment to the office, the same position will be found confirmed, by a reference to individual cases, in which the singing of the levites is described or adverted to. When the priests first brought the ark into the holy place prepared for it in the temple, "*the levites,* "*which were the singers, all of them of Asaph, of Hernon, and* "*of Geduthun, with their sons and their brethren,*" are described as being "*arrayed in white linen, having cymbols, and* "*psalteries, and harps, and standing at the east end of the altar,*

"*and with them an hundred and twenty priests,*" (ministers or courtiers) "*sounding with trumpets.*" Their singing is then described; and surely, if at all, on so solemn an occasion as the present, they would have called on the people "*by "responses, to express their participation and concurrence;*" but of this we hear nothing, for "*It came to pass that the "trumpeters and singers*" (not the people) "*were as one, to "make one sound to be heard in praising and thanking the "Lord; and they lifted up their voice with the trumpets, and "cymbols, and instruments of music, and praised the Lord, "saying—For he is good, for his mercy endureth for ever.*" (2 Chron. v. 12.) The cleansing of the house of God by Hezekiah, (2 Chron. xxix) may be referred to in support of the same fact. The king "*set the levites in the house of the "Lord, with cymbols, with psalteries, and with harps, for so "was the commandment of the Lord by his prophets.*" (v. 25.) At the end of the sacrifice "*the king and all that were pre-"sent with him bowed themselves and worshipped.*" (v. 29.) Of the levites it is separately said that *they* too "*bowed "their heads and worshipped;*" (v. 30.) but of them one thing is recorded which is *not* predicated of the congregation, namely—that "*they sang praises with gladness.*" Not one word is said as to the people's joining in these songs of gladness; indeed it is expressly said (v. 30) that "*Hezekiah, "the king, and the princes, commanded the Levites*" (not the people) "*to sing praises unto the Lord with the words of "David, and of Asaph the seer.*" The passover is then observed with unusual solemnity; of *the people* it is recorded that "*the children of Israel which were present at Jerusalem "kept the feast of unleavened bread seven days with great "gladness;*" (xxx. 21) but of the *levites and priests*, or attendants, it is expressly added that *they* (as distinguished from the people just named) "*praised the Lord day by day, "singing with loud instruments unto the Lord.*" (See also to the same effect the passover as kept by Josiah, described in the 35th chapter.—See also Ezra iii. 11.) Numerous other passages might be cited to the same effect, all tending to establish the fact—that the people did *not* join socially in the songs of the levites. In full support of this same position we quote the following passage from Lewis, (Hebrew Antiquities, b. II. ch. 12) who, let it be remembered, is constantly quoted in support of social prayer and singing as having been practised by the Jews.

"Another part of the levitical ministry consisted in singing, and the singers, as the priests, were divided into twenty-four courses. It is dis-

puted whether any were employed in the temple music but the levites only. If any were it was necessary they should be as near the priesthood as possible, both for alliance and accomplishments; but (even) when they were thoroughly qualified, THEY WERE NOT ADMITTED TO JOIN VOICES WITH THE VOCAL MUSIC, WHICH WAS THE PROPER SONG, AND THE PROPER SERVICE, *but only with the instrumental.*"

As though he were determined to shew the case we are contending for as strongly as possible, this writer adds, in the way of explanation—

"That is, if a person of singular worth and piety, or who was nearly allied to the priesthood, had applied himself to musical devotion, and offered his service to the choir, *he was allowed to join his instrument among the other;* BUT HE WAS NOT ADMITTED AMONG THE VOICES, FOR THAT SERVICE WAS PECULIAR TO THE LEVITES."

How Mr. Moore, who actually cites the above work amongst his authorities on the subject of "*the religious ser-* "*vices of the temple,*" (Inquiry, p. 44) can reconcile this extreme strictness in confining the temple singing, so peculiarly to the levites, with his own assertions, (p. 56) that the levites merely *conducted* the singing, the people, by responses, "expressing their participation and concur- "rence," and "joining in it throughout"—how Mr. Moore can reconcile these things we confess that we cannot say. This, however, we *can* say, most confidently—that the whole tenor of scripture authority goes to support the contrary fact, namely—that the people did *not,* by responses, thus join with the levites; and that they did *not* thus accompany them in their songs throughout, or indeed at all.*

---

* It is curious to observe the effect which the strong evidence existing—that the levites were *not* joined by the people in their singing has, indirectly and unwillingly, has had upon some writers on this subject, who would fain, had they had the *boldness* of Mr. Moore, have found the contrary to be the fact. Bennett, in his "Brief History of Joint Prayer," (chap. 2) when treating on "The Practice of the Antient Jews," adduces certain cases of, what he considers, "pre-composed set forms of prayer." The writer's courage here appears to fail him, for he candidly avows "I "confess the instances I have produced are very few;" but then he consoles himself with the thought—that they are "very express and clear;" (we have already shewn most of them to be inapplicable) and he draws the singular conclusion—that the practice of the levites is "as good as "many thousands." "Neither" (he adds) "can any person reasonably "expect that I should be able to produce many instances, if he considers "that, *besides the psalms sung by the levites in the temple,* and some few other "extraordinary services, there is no ground for us to think that there were "any prayers jointly offered to God by the Jews, either in their temple or "elsewhere." Here, let it be observed, is an incidental concession that

Independent of these cases expressly on record, a review of the compositions sung in the temple, or such of them as have come down to us, would sufficiently prove, from their tenor—their sentiments—the circumstances under which, and the parties by whom, they were sung, that they afford no precedent whatever for the modern practice of public social prayer and singing. As to what were the songs or psalms originally offered up in the temple, we have now little, if any, certain information.* Some modern writers, founding their assertions upon the present practice of the

---

the levites only, not in conjunction with the people, sung in the temple; and that by a writer, whose express object being to defend set forms, and pre-composed liturgies, would have been glad to prove that the people *did* socially join with the levites. Of some of the psalms he says, (p. 19) "I confess they are proper for a whole congregation; but *who can prove* "that those psalms were jointly used in their synagogues, *or by any per-* "*sons, except the levites, in the temple itself?*" There is a degree of *naiveté* in this question. Thomas Bennett, M.A. lived early in the eighteenth century; had he lived in the nineteenth, he would have found writers who, if they could not have "*proved*" that these psalms were "*jointly* "*used by other persons*," would have, at least, *asserted* it.

* The book called "The Psalms," is, we believe, generally considered as containing the songs of the temple worship, the *whole* of them being regarded as having been sung there. "In the Psalms" (observes Mr. Moore, p. 37) there are *many instances* adapted, and adapted only, to public social "worship. *They are evidently composed for the temple service.*" He further asserts, that "a considerable part" of them were thus used; yet of the six which he quotes, or adverts to, we think good reason might be shewn for believing that five out of the number were *not* written for that purpose; the fact being that a great part, perhaps we may say the majority, of "The Psalms" not being adapted to, and evidently not intended for, the temple service. The churches of Rome, and of England, together with some classes of dissenters, acting on the contrary impression, have pressed *the whole* into their service, and provide for the repeating the entire 150 in the course of each month. Some absurd consequences result in consequence to the self-appointed levites of the day, and their followers. Thus the good people of England, according to the rubric of the established church, are called upon, on the first of every month, in the evening service, to declare (as they say, *before God*) that they have "*washed their bed and watered their couch with* "*tears*," when, perhaps, there was not a wet eye in the congregation; whilst the parson of every parish is made to declare "My *beauty* is gone away for "very trouble;" or to assert (as in the 69th Psalm) "*But I am poor and sor-* "*rowful.*" A strange declaration for, perhaps, a fat pluralist, or a fox-hunting parson. Imagine such a one, (as directed by the service of the 13th of the month) though dressed in a silk surplice, declaring (Ps. lxix. 10) "*I put on sack-cloth also;*" and the people, after coming from their Sunday feast, responding "*They gave me gall to eat, and when I was thirsty they gave* "*me vinegar to drink.*" And this, by the established practice, is said—not of or by one individual—but by the clerk and all the parish! On the 22d of the month, when the 109th Psalm, in which David describes the evil wishes of his enemies against him, is appointed by the modern practice of

Jews, or borrowing their information from the rabbinical writings, (which refer to a much later period) profess to define with the greatest exactness what psalms were used on each day, in the earliest period of the temple worship. (See Moore, p. 50 & 54.) Such statements are, however, evidently without due authority; and many of the psalms quoted, as evidently, from their contents and construction, could not have been used at the time, and in the way asserted. That some, however, of the psalms sung by the levites have come down to us is undisputed; and from such we may collect—

First, That these compositions were national songs and anthems, which were, with great appropriateness, sung by the officers appointed specifically for the performance of that amongst other political duties.

Second, That as these officers (the levites) were, as we have seen, especially appointed to the work of praise or thanksgiving, and not to that of prayer or petition; so the songs which they sung consisted chiefly of the former, and but rarely and incidentally, if at all, of the latter.

Whilst citing a few cases in further support of these positions, we shall have occasion to draw the attention of the reader to the marked distinction existing between praise and prayer; a distinction wholly confounded, or lost sight of, in the arguments generally adopted by the defenders of public social worship.

To illustrate the nature of these compositions, we shall advert to one instance of a psalm which has come down to us, accompanied with an intimation that it was sung by the levites. When the ark was brought up by David, the king "*delivered first this psalm, to thank the Lord, into the hands* "*of Asaph and his brethren.*" The psalm is given at length. (1 Chron. xvi. 8.) What was its object? what are its contents? They will be found to consist of praise and thanks-

---

saying or singing alternate verses, the parson and the congregation are made to exchange against each other the bitterest imprecations; they indeed

"Unpack their hearts with words,
"And fall a cursing like a very drab—
"A scullion."

But what is worse than even all this are the sentiments of piety, of resignation, and of virtue, which are thus *forced* upon the lips of the prophane, the violent, and the vicious. In this, however, we should be forestalling a future part of our subject, our only object in this note being to illustrate the absurdities into which men *must* fall when they adopt, for the purposes of *social* worship, compositions which are individual, and intended for other objects. Truly they are of the number

"Who, undisturbed by conscientious qualms,
"Pervert the Prophets and purloin the Psalms."

giving, wholly referring to national and political circumstances. "*Give thanks unto the Lord,*" is the commencement; "*his deeds, and his wondrous works, and his judgments,*" are then adverted to: a reference is then made to their being "*his servants,*" *his chosen ones;* he is especially spoken of "*as the Lord,* THEIR *God.*" The place in which this reference was made, (before the ark) the parties by whom it was made, (the levites or courtiers of Jehovah) all shew the political nature of a song like this. The mention of the Lord as *their* God, is naturally followed by historical allusions to the covenant with Abraham, its renewal with Isaac and Jacob, their after wanderings, and their final establishment in the land of Canaan; and an inference is drawn as to the superiority of the Lord over all the gods of the people. Finally, the kindreds of the people are called upon "*to give* "*glory unto the Lord—to bring an offering before him—to* "*worship him in the beauty of holiness—to give thanks to the* "*Lord, for he is good;*" the whole concluding with this striking admonition to thanksgiving—"*And* SAY YE, '*Save* "*us, O God of our salvation, and gather us together, and de-* "*liver us from the heathen, that we may give thanks to thy* "*holy name, and glory in thy praise.*'" This, let it be particularly observed, is *not* thanksgiving on the part of the people, but exhortation merely to the people, that they *should* offer up prayer or praise; and it is added, that the people said *Amen;* (a term not translated, which has since been much abused, but which signified merely agreement or assent), and *then* the people, complying with the exhortation of the levites, *praised the Lord;* no doubt, *individually* offered up their praises, in the manner which we shall have occasion more particularly to inquire into in our next succeeding Essay.* We have noticed this psalm the more at length, as it has been adduced as a specimen of the hymns really sung by the levites in the tabernacle and temple.

The confession of the levites on the rebuilding of the temple, (Neh. ix.) is, in many respects, to the same effect; but we cannot go at greater length into this subject, further than to refer the inquirer to certain of the psalms, in support of

* Mr. Moore most unfairly quotes this psalm as "a specimen of devout "thanksgiving," in which the people unanimously joined. As the word *psalm* does not occur in the original, he suggests, that it should be called a *prayer*, and then dropping the whole body of the psalm, which is evidently *not* prayer, he skips to the conclusion, and gives that which at the most, was an *exhortation* to prayer, (*say ye*, &c.) as being prayer itself. Having laid down *such* premises, he easily draws the conclusion "*The people, therefore, joined unanimously in these public acts of worship.*"

these same views. We would name the 136th psalm, which, after noticing the wisdom and power of God, as visible in the works of nature, takes a review of the history of the people of Israel, and their various deliverances, till "*the* "*land was given for an heritage unto Israel his servant.*" The 33d psalm, it is also not improbable, was sung by the levites. It begins with an exhortation to rejoice in, and to praise the Lord: (verse 3) "*Sing unto him a new song: play* "*skilfully with a loud noise.*" This psalm also adverts to the power and providence of God, in watching over his peculiar people: (verse 10) "*The Lord bringeth the counsel of the* "*heathen to nought.*"—"*Blessed is the nation whose God is the* "*Lord; and the people whom he hath chosen for his own inheri-* "*tance;*" expressions all bearing reference to the peculiar situation of the Jews and the nature of the temple worship. The 105th psalm is peculiarly of this kind; it enters, even in detail, into the *history and political circumstances* of the Jewish people; the levites being, in the opening of the song, thus admonished: "*O give thanks unto the Lord; call upon his* "*name; make known his deeds among the people.*"

The language of the 95th psalm also would appear to bear out the idea, that it was one of those which were sung—socially sung by the levites, (*not* by the people) as the appointed ministers of Jehovah.—"*Oh come, let us sing unto the Lord;* "*let us heartily rejoice in the strength of our salvation; let us,*" (the levites, the servants appointed for that especial purpose) "*come before* HIS PRESENCE *with thanksgiving, and* "*shew ourselves glad in him with psalms.*" The reason is immediately given: "*FOR the Lord is A GREAT GOD; A GREAT KING ABOVE ALL GODS.*" In the presence of THE GREAT KING, they are also to do homage: "*O come, let us* "*worship and bow down; let us kneel before the Lord, our* "*maker.*" Here then, we find the levites prostrate before the throne of God, and singing praises in his presence; but *of* prayer, *social or individual,* we find no mention; *to* prayer, *social or individual,* we discover no reference or allusion. The reason of their worship, or bending the knee, (as before, of their rejoicing) is immediately added: "FOR HE IS OUR "GOD, AND WE ARE HIS PEOPLE, AND THE SHEEP OF HIS "PASTURE." Finally, in this view, we shall notice the 135th psalm, which contains similar historical allusions to the mercies of Jehovah towards "*Jacob, whom he had chosen*" —"*and Israel, his peculiar treasure;*" but, which particularly defines *who* it was that was appointed to sing praises in his presence: "*Praise ye the Lord, O* YE SERVANTS OF THE "*LORD; YE THAT STAND IN THE HOUSE OF THE LORD,*

"*IN THE COURTS OF THE HOUSE OF OUR GOD.*" We may remark, that no allusion being here made to the supposed responses of the people, it may fairly be concluded, in the language of Lewis, that the service of song was "*peculiar to the levites.*"

Taking a review of the above, we would appeal to every inquiring mind, not only, whether we are not fully borne out in the position laid down, that the levites were *not* joined by the people; but also that their songs were chiefly, if not wholly, *national* and *political*, sung by the courtiers, in the supposed presence of the king of Israel. Should it be asked, Are they not, as such, objects of *our* imitation?—should we be required to say why *we* should not, like the levites, sing songs of praise and thanksgiving—we answer, certainly, if we have the same command that they had; if we, too, have a court or palace, where we believe God to be especially present. If the same causes exist, let the effect be the same; but not otherwise. Are we to have the forms and ceremonies of the court, when the court itself, as a local place on earth, has ceased to exist? But this argument, if good for any thing, is good for more than it is brought to prove. If we are to have the songs, we should also have the levites; if the levites, we should have the priests; if the priests, the altar; if the altar, the sacrifice; and so on till we have every part of the Jewish ritual and the temple service; for they all stand upon the same ground, and are defensible on the same principles—the command of God, and the belief in his peculiar presence. Besides, if our psalms are to be like those of the Jews, let us see that they be *really* like, and not so only in appearance. If these psalms are to be the model of *English* social worship, in order to maintain the parallel, *our* psalms should, like theirs, contain constant reference to our national history and political circumstances, whether of adversity or prosperity; our Saxon and Norman ancestry should be frequently alluded to; the Reformation, and "the glorious Revolution of 1688," should receive their due notice; Magna Charta and the Bill of Rights, should be constantly insisted on; the French, and not the Philistines, should be the burthen of *our* song; the Thames, and not the Jordan, should be spoken of, as flowing round our city; Windsor Forest should be substituted for the Forest of Lebanon, and Mount Sion give place to the praises of Ludgate Hill. These psalms, thus referring to our national history, and illustrative of our local scenery, (for such were those of the Jews) should be sung, not all over the country, but *in one appointed and especial place*, the palace and pecu-

liar residence of Jehovah; and they should further be sung, not by a set of self-called priests, spread over the country, and professing to devote themselves exclusively to religious purposes, but by our courtiers and ministers of state, or by the large class of persons holding places under government. The very statement of the question assumes an air of ridicule: the ridicule, however, arises out of the subject, and does not originate or rest with us. If the singing of the levites is proposed to us as a model, we ought to imitate that model. The circumstances we have referred to, were not accidental merely, or indifferent and incidental ones; they were vital and essential. The levites sang in the temple, *because* the temple was the palace of Jehovah; *because* the Jews were his peculiar people; *because* they (the levites) were his servants, appointed for that especial purpose. Remove the *causes*, and the effect ought to cease. A nation which professes *no* belief of this kind; which acknowledges *no* such peculiar presence; which has *no* such appointed servants—the very grounds and causes of the singing of the levites—cannot surely pretend to imitate their service. Yet in modern times, when the causes do not exist, it is absurdly contended, that the effects ought to remain: hence the irrational conclusons into which the defenders of social prayer and singing are driven; hence their illogical and inconclusive reference to the temple worship, in support of a system, and under a state of things *essentially* different from those under which the temple existed.

One distinction of considerable importance in this discussion, we have more than once glanced at, and may now more directly notice; it is the distinction between praise or thanksgiving, and prayer or petition. It was the first only, (that is, praise or thanksgiving) and not the last, (that is, prayer or petition) which was *the appointed service* of the levites in the temple. A reference to the many passages we have quoted as to their singing in the temple, will fully establish this. Those who adduce the practice of the Jewish temple, in support of the modern practice, endeavour to confound this important distinction. Thus, we have already seen, (verse i. p. 350) that Mr. Moore, when speaking of the "devout addresses of praise and thanksgiving," sung by Asaph and the other levites, speaks of them as "*social acts* "*of praise and* PRAYER;" thus using thanksgiving and prayer as convertible terms. A review of the subject, however, will shew, that there is a material, and indeed, for the purposes of our argument, an essential difference between them. We are discussing the propriety of *social* prayer. One of the

principal objections to this practice (on the ground of reason, and independent of scripture authority) consists in the absurdity of supposing, that, as a general rule, and except on some very especial occasion, a number of individuals should join in the same prayer or petition to the Supreme Being; with different, often contrary dispositions, having various wants, and placed in dissimilar circumstances, it is, we contend, absolutely *impossible*, that the same form of words should *habitually* suit the dispositions, the wants, and the circumstances of all. The *future* must ever be variable and uncertain; therefore, the prayer of different individuals, (which are only their wishes with regard to that future, embodied in words) must, upon the whole, necessarily be different. The *past*, on the contrary, is fixed and certain: for praise and thanksgiving, therefore, there is evidently something definite, upon which a number of individuals might, beforehand, be supposed much more likely to agree, and to join with one voice. Let us in this point of view, look at the levites, and call to mind, the psalms or songs which they offered in the temple. It has been established, that in these they were *not* joined by the people. They sang on the part of the nation, indeed, but the nation was not—could not be present; the whole were not present at *any* time, and it is probable, from the construction of the temple and its courts, that no part of the people were ever immediately present during the time of sacrifice and singing, with either priests or levites. What then were the themes and subjects of their songs? *Praises* of the great, all-wise, and all-powerful King, within whose presence they stood. *Thanksgiving* for the long continued and manifold blessings, which had attended the whole progress, national and political, of the Jewish people. If, occasionally, their language assumed the form of petition, or of adjuration rather, it was the brief expression of some general wish, that the same blessings, national and political, might be continued to the Jewish people. But a form of expression like this, for it was no more than a form of expression, cannot be construed into a precedent for a regular, avowed, and stated form of prayer, still less of *social* prayer between the priest and people; for here the people did not join—they were not permitted to join in the songs offered up in the presence and palace of the Most High. "*To record, and to thank, and* "*to praise*," was the appointed duty and peculiar privilege of the levites who sang in the temple. Their songs were to these levites, what the sacrifices were to the priests—a means of rendering homage to Deity in his court or palace,

The *prayers* of the people were equally distinct from each of these; offered up individually in another part of the sacred spot—in one of the outer courts of the temple; *these*, as being the acts of the Jewish *people, if any thing*—and if we *are* are still to be governed by notions and practices prior to the teaching of Jesus—should be the objects of imitation to the English *people;* they should not seek to follow the example of the levites and the priests; officers separate and distinguished from the people, whose duties, and whose very existence, arose out of peculiar circumstances which have long since ceased, and of peculiar views which we should no longer be justified in entertaining.

Reviewing then what we have written, we would appear to have established these points, or to have arrived at the following conclusions, namely—that the levites were "ministers of state, and of civil government, as well as of "religion;" that, in conformity with the manners of the age, and the habits of the people, songs were introduced into the temple worship, the temple being considered as the palace of their God and king; that such songs were peculiar to the levites, and were not joined in socially by the people; that the psalms which were sung there were national anthems, at once referring to the history and political circumstances, and to the peculiar, and even to the confined, views of the Jewish people with regard to religion; and, lastly, that the levites were not appointed to pray, but to offer up praises and thanksgiving in the presence of the God of the Jews. From these positions we may draw the general inference—that the singing of the levites affords no sanction or precedent for the modern practice of public social prayer and singing.

Having thus shewn, in our preceding Essay, that the modern practice of public social worship can derive no sanction from the sacrifice of the priest; and, in the present Essay, that it is equally without support from the singing of the levites—both of whom were officers distinct from the people, and not either joining them in worship, whether of prayer or otherwise, or leading their devotions—we purpose in our next number directing our attention to the *prayer* of the Jewish temple, not doubting but that we shall be able to prove to the satisfaction of every candid and inquiring mind—that that prayer was *separate* and *individual;* and not, as now practised, and now defended, *joint* and *social*.

LETTER

WRITTEN BY A DECEASED FEMALE MEMBER OF THE FREETHINKING CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

We have to submit to our readers the copy of a letter written by a female member of our body to a friend then in a distant part of the country. The marriage of the writer, scarcely a year since, was noticed in our article, in our first volume, on *Dissenters' Marriages;* and whilst our pages were preparing for the press, she was called from the present state of existence, after having given birth to a daughter. Death, especially in the young, is a theme which the rational and the reflecting mind may always turn to a good account. We leave the fact, however, to work its own effect upon the minds of our readers. It is the common practice of religious publications to record in an *obituary*, the deaths of individuals in their connection, (and sometimes *out* of their connection) with inflated accounts of the virtues and excellencies of the deceased. We avoid, because we disapprove of this practice as ostentatious at the best, and not unfrequently false and hypocritical.

Of the nameless writer of this letter we have only to say then, in the way of explanation, she lived in the humbler walks of life: that she possessed none of the advantages of early education, and pretended to none of the ostentatious accomplishments which attract the attention and command the applause of the world, may, perhaps, be visible even from the composition which we subjoin; but higher and better qualities are visible in it; and to the gainsayer of our faith, and of our principles, we would point to this letter, and say—"Behold an example of the efficacy of "that faith, and the strength and value of those principles "which, in the silent and unobserved walks of private life, "and in the quiet and unobtrusive complexion of the "female domestic character, could produce sentiments like "these: and" (from our knowledge of the writer we may confidently add) "which could also produce dispositions "and actions conformable to such sentiments."

"November 6, 1823.

My Dear Mrs. ————,

I half expected ere this to have received a letter from you; but I have first taken the quill weapon in hand, in order to provoke you to retaliate, as I much wish to hear from you; for, although I gave you up the day you left London, as one with whom I should have but little more personal intercouse, still I cannot give up the hope that a written one may be kept up between us. I understand from your

husband the decision which has taken place with respect to your remaining in ————; how far that decision is right, or wise, time must determine, but it does not appear satisfactorily to my mind that it is so. That I regret it on my own account I must grant; but I likewise sincerely regret it on yours, and feel anxiously solicitous that under the difficulties which, as a Christian, you must have to meet with, you will conduct yourself in the manner which, as a Christian, you ought to do.

You are aware that the strongest objection I have to your final removal from London is the separation which must unavoidably take place between yourselves and the *church*—and such a *church!* A separation much to be dreaded, as it appears to me, even by the best and strongest minds; believe me there is a wide difference between associating with persons of the same principles and pursuits, bound, as it were, in one common interest and living together, and associating only with those of the *world;* but, being so placed, it will require the utmost care and circumspection on your part, the most deliberate consideration, may I add also the use of PRAYER to that GREAT and GOOD BEING whom we have been taught to revere and love, that he may guide your reason, and give you a firm and discriminating mind, that you may know how to "choose the *good* "and refuse the *evil*," however delusive the form that evil may wear.

That prosperity may attend your new undertaking I cordially wish, providing that prosperity should promote your best interests—the improvement of your character, and the better fitting you for future happiness! Before you are immersed in the bustle and cares of business, pause and reflect! Remember the prayer of Solomon, when first commencing his reign over the children of Israel. When Deity, in a vision of the night, asked him, "What "he should give?" Solomon did not request riches, honours, or prolonged life; "but give" said he, "thy servant an understanding "heart to judge thy people, that I may discern between GOOD and "BAD:" and the record says, "that the Lord was pleased, and "granted his request, and added to it riches and honours;" and "if," it was further said, "thou wilt walk in my ways, to keep my statutes "and my commandments, then I will lengthen thy days," In conformity with this is the language of our master Jesus also, when he says, "Lay up for yourselves treasures in Heaven; for where "your treasure is, there will your heart be also." And again, "Seek ye first the kingdom of God, and his righteousness, and all "these things shall be added unto ye." May we seek this treasure, my dear friend! May we seek it with assiduous care; may we act, under all circumstances, however difficult, as becometh obedient children, even the adopted children of the Most High!!! *Distinguished Privilege!* *High honour!*

Let us reflect, seriously reflect, on the great responsibility incurred by every individual becoming a member of such a church as ours; a church designed by its divine founder to be "the Light of "the World." Let us keep a watchful eye upon our hearts, that

our actions bring no evil report or slander upon the family of God: and this ought equally to be our case whether we are surrounded by the members of the church, or isolated individuals separated from the whole; we cannot go where the eye of Omniscience cannot penetrate. May we be careful to remember, "that where much is given, "much will be required;" and much indeed has been given to us: the principles of Christianity are a valuable deposit, which we should guard with vigilant assiduity, by a conduct worthy of the trust; and when we feel oppressed by difficulties or weakness, may we be enabled to beg assistance of *him* who alone can give it.

Forgive my thus taking upon myself the language of advice; but anticipating as I do the difficulties which, as a *Christian* so circumstanced you will have to contend with, although perhaps neither you nor myself can form an exact idea of what those difficulties may be, I feel I should be neglecting my duty, as a christian sister, did I omit to do so. From the same sense of duty on your part, remember I claim a return; do not run away with a notion that there is no need of it; there is, I can assure you, a great deal. When I think of the advantages with which I have been blessed, I sink in my own estimation, and am humbled to reflect on the little fruit the good seed has produced. Indeed the review of my mind these last few months creates great dissatisfaction, and I stand in my heart self-condemned: no pleasing state; but I hope it will be useful, and spur me on to increased and renewed exertion; nor will I soon despair; however little the ground I gain, that little shall, and I trust will, encourage me on to the end. I have indeed an important field of action in view—may I be fitted for my task, or life in mercy be taken from me.

I don't know any thing of importance occurring in the church, excepting the marriage of a young man, named ——, who has been separated, by distance, from the church for three years, but notwithstanding this he has conducted himself in a manner which does credit to *our* principles and *his* character. His wife was acknowledged a member of the church previous to their marriage.

Mr. —— begs me, before I close my letter, to present his best respects, and to tell you that he shall never lose the sense of your disinterested kindness towards him, when he most stood in need; and we both hope, however distant the time may be, that the hour may at last arrive, when we may hail you with a hearty welcome as a visitor in London; indeed, we often regret your absence: your occasional presence by our fire-side these long evenings would add much to its pleasures. My health is much better than when you left London. Believe me, dear Mrs. ——, to remain sincerely and affectionately,

Your Friend,

——————"

NOT PAUL, BUT JESUS.

BY GAMALIEL SMITH, ESQ.

UNDER the above hypocritical title, and assumed name, an octavo volume has been ushered into the world, by Mr. Jeremy Bentham; the object of which is to destroy the truth of the Christian religion, by denying Paul's claims to the apostleship, the truth of his conversion, the reality of his miracles, and the purity of his character. Had Mr. Bentham have entitled his work "*Neither Paul, nor Jesus,*" we should then only have had to complain, that he had written a very weak, virulent, and dull book against Christianity; but by assuming that his object, though opposed to Paul, is friendly to Jesus, by pretending that Paul's writings have been the cause of "*all the mischiefs which have* "*been imputed to the religion of Jesus;*" and that "*by the* "*clearing it*" (Christianity) "*of this incumbrance, not only* "*as yet unexampled purity, but additional extent, may not un-* "*reasonably be expected to be given to it,*" he adds to the discredit of bad argument, the disgrace of insincerity; since it becomes evident from his performance, that he believes no more in the miracles and mission of Jesus, than in those of Paul. It was at once to expose the fallacy of the reasoner, and the dishonesty of the man, that the Freethinking Christians recently announced, through the medium of the public advertisements, their intention of publicly examining the work "Not Paul, but Jesus," at their place of public religious instruction; and that strict justice might be done to the author, the following letter, apprizing him of their intention, and inviting his attendance, was forwarded to his publisher.

"SIR,—The religious body commonly known by the name of Freethinking Christians, (believers in "the gospel" common to Jesus *and* Paul, and admirers of the characters of each) purpose publicly to examine the arguments, refute the falsehoods, and unmask the hypocrisy of your book entitled "*Not Paul, but Jesus.*"

"To this examination, they now invite you: should you accept the same, and feel desirous, when they have *completed* their examination of your book, to reply to the arguments that may be adduced, an opportunity will be readily afforded you for that purpose.

"In such an offer, they trust will be manifest, their attachment to truth, and their willingness to support it.

"The first examination of your book will take place as under, on Sunday next, the 11th inst. to commence at eleven o'clock; and the subject will be resumed at the same time, on the following Sunday.

Meeting-house of the Church of God, commonly called Freethinking Christians', Crescent, Jewin Street.

January 8th, 1824.

At the meetings which took place in pursuance of this intimation, Mr. Bentham *did not* appear, although several of his satellites were visible, by whom he has probably been informed of the complete analysis and successful exposure of his book, which, during four successive meetings, continued to fix the attention of crowded and respectable audiences. As the substance of the discourses delivered on these occasions, may possibly come in a distinct form before the public, it is not our intention to present even an outline of the arguments then adopted, but shall content ourselves with submiting to the reader, the extracts from the scriptures, which were offered by one of the speakers at the last meeting, in answer to Mr. Bentham's confident, not to say dogmatical, assertion, *that Paul taught a different gospel to that of Jesus.*

With reference, however, to the general merits of Mr. Bentham's book, we cannot help premising, that viewing him as a man of education and of talent, and considering him as a writer, who, notwithstanding the intolerable obscurity and pedantry of his style, has long been successfully engaged in the dissemination of opinions favourable to the cause of liberty and the advancement of human happiness, we lament on the one hand, that this, his unworthy performance, should tend to tarnish the lustre, and consequently, lessen the utility, of his former writings; whilst on the other hand, we rejoice at the triumph that is obtained for the cause of Christianity, in the fact, that, when opposing this divine system, even the powerful conceptions of a Bentham, have produced an abortion!

After citing Mr. Bentham's assertion, that by "*the gospels* "*and Paul's epistles, two quite different, if not opposite religions, were inculcated;*" that the religion of Paul "*has no just* "*title to be considered, as forming part of the religion of Jesus;*" and that "*his doctrine was partly one of his own, contrary to* "*that of Jesus's apostles, and therefore, contrary to that of* "*Jesus,*" the speaker proceeded to observe, that it might have been expected, some evidence would have been offered by Mr. Bentham, of the truth of these assertions; some statement in the language of Jesus and of Paul, of the doctrines taught by each, in which the asserted disagreement and contradiction should be made to appear; but that Mr. Bentham had not deigned to adduce any evidence of this description; he took credit for this assertion with the reader, and expected such credit would be given him. As, however, he (the speaker) could not take assertions, such as these, without reference to the authority by which alone they could be attested, he

should proceed to supply Mr. Bentham's deficiencies, and to conclude his remarks, by adducing evidence to prove, not merely the agreement in the gospel taught by Jesus and Paul, but also the complete agreement in their general doctrines, sentiments, and even modes of thinking!

JESUS.	PAUL.
OBJECT OF WORSHIP, AND BY WHOM REVEALED.	
"And this is eternal life, that they might know thee, the *only true God*, and *Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent.*"—John xvii. 3.	"For though there be that are called Gods, whether in heaven or on earth, to us there is but *one God the Father, of whom are all things* and we in him; and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things and we by him."—1 Cor. viii. 5.
DOCTRINE OF REPENTANCE.	
"Now after that John was put in prison Jesus came into Gallilee, preaching the gospel of the kingdom of God, and saying the time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand—*repent ye*, and believe the gospel."—Mark i. 14, 15.	—"I have shewed you and have taught you publicly, and from house to house, testifying both to the Jews, and also to the Greeks, *repentance towards God*, and faith in our Lord Jesus Christ."—Acts xx. 20, 21.
DOCTRINE OF THE RESURRECTION.	
"For as the Father hath life in himself so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself, and hath *given him authority to execute judgment* because he is the son of man. Marvel not at this, for the hour is coming in which all that are in their graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth—they that have done good into the resurrection of life—and they that have done evil unto the resurrection of condemnation."—John v. 26, 29.	"And the time of this ignorance God winketh at; but now commandeth he men every where to repent, because he hath appointed a day in which he will *judge the world in righteousness* by that *man whom he hath ordained*, whereof he hath given assurance unto all men in that he hath raised him from the dead."—Acts xvii. 30, 31.
CALL OF THE GENTILES.	
"And that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among *all nations*, BEGINNING at Jerusalem."—Luke xxiv. 47.	"Then Paul and Barnabus waxed bold, and saw it was necessary the word of God should *first* have been spoken to you, but seeing ye put it from you, and judge yourselves unworthy of everlasting life, lo! we turn to the *gentiles;* for *so* hath the *Lord commanded us*, saying I have set thee to be a light of the *gentiles*, that thou shouldest be for salvation to the ends of the earth."—Acts xiii. 46, 47.
UNION OF JEWS AND GENTILES INTO ONE BODY.	
"And other sheep I have which are not of this fold; them also I must bring, (in) and they shall hear my voice, and there shall be *one fold* and *one shepherd.*"—John x. 16.	"For as the body is *one* and hath many members, and all the members of that *one body* being many *are one*, so also is *Christ;* for by one spirit are we all baptized into *one body*,

JESUS.	PAUL.
	whether we be *Jews or Gentiles*, whether we be bond or free."—1 Cor. xii. 12, 14.
AUTHORITY OF CHRIST.	
"All things are delivered to me of my Father, and no man knoweth the Son but the Father; neither knoweth any man the Father save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal him."—Mat. xi. 27.	*(Paul describes Christ as exalted)*—"Far above all principality and power, and might, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world but that which is to come. And hath put all things under his feet, and given him to be head over all things to the church."—Eph. i. 21, 22.
EQUALITY OF CHRISTIAN MEMBERS.	
"Be not ye called Rabbi, for one is your master, even Christ, and all ye are brethren."—Mat. xxiii. 7, 8, 9.	"For I say, through the grace of God given unto me, to every man that is among you, *not to think of himself more highly than he ought to think*—but to think soberly accordingly as God hath dealt to every man the measure of faith. For as we have many members in one body, and all members have not the same office, so we being many are one body in Christ, and every one *severally fellow members* thereof."—Rom. xii. 3, 4.
SPIRITUAL AMBITION AND SELFISHNESS CONDEMNED.	
"And he said unto them the kings of the Gentiles *exercise lordship* over them, and they that exercise authority upon them are *called benefactors*, but it shall not be so with you."—Luke xxii. 25, 26.	"For ye suffer fools gladly seeing ye yourselves are wise, for you suffer if a man bring you into bondage—if a man devour you—if a man take of you—if a man exalt himself—if a man smite you on the face."—1 Cor. xi. 19, 20.
WHO FITTED TO RECEIVE CHRISTIANITY.	
"At that time Jesus answered and said, I thank thee, O Father! Lord of heaven and earth, because thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them unto babes; even so, Father, for so it seemeth good in thy sight."—Mat. xi. 25.	"For ye see your calling, brethren, how that not many wise men after the flesh; not many mighty; not many noble are called; but God hath chosen the foolish things of the world to confound the mighty."—1 Cor. i. 26.
SPIRITUALITY OF THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION.	
"God is a spirit, and they that worship him must *worship him* IN SPIRIT and in truth."—John iv. 24.	"For we are the circumcision which *worship God in the* SPIRIT, and rejoice in Christ Jesus, and have no confidence in the flesh."—Phil. iii. 3.
FORGIVENESS OF INJURIES.	
"But I say unto you, Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use	"Dearly beloved avenge not yourselves, but rather give place unto wrath, as it is written, &c.: therefore, if thine enemy hunger, feed him; if

JESUS.	PAUL.
you and persecute you."—Matt. v. 44, 45.	he thirst, give him drink; for in so doing thou shalt heap coals of fire on his head.—Be not overcome of evil, but overcome evil with good."—Rom. xii. 19 to 21.

BENEVOLENCE.

"But when thou makest a feast call the poor, the maimed, the lame, the blind, and thou shalt be blessed, for *they* cannot recompense thee, for thou shalt be recompensed at the resurrection of the just."—Luke xiv. 13, 14.	"And though I bestow all my goods to feed the poor, and though I give my body to be burned, and have not *benevolence* it profiteth me nothing."—1 Cor. xiii. 3.

LOVE, THE EVIDENCE OF CHRISTIAN UNION.

"By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have love one to another."—John xiii. 35.	"If there be, therefore, any consolation in Christ; if any comfort of love; if any fellowship of the spirit; if any *tender compassion*; fulfil ye my joy, by having the same disposition, the same love, the same mind."—Phil. ii. 1, 2. *Wakefield.*

NOTICES.

THE following Subjects are appointed by the Church of God, denominated Freethinking Christians, for the instruction of the Public on the Sunday Mornings, at their Meeting-house, Crescent, Jewin Street, Aldersgate Street.—The Business commences at Eleven o'Clock PRECISELY.

April 4.—The Parables of Jesus.

April 11.—Popular objections to the Doctrine of the Trinity.

April 18.—The Analogy between natural and revealed Religion.

April 25.—An Answer to the Question—"Why are you a Christian?"

May 2.—An Answer to the Question—"Why are you a Dissenter?"

May 9.—The Character of David explained and defended.

May 16.—The insufficiency of *Pulpit Preaching* to produce religious knowledge and improvement.

May 23.—Reason the sole Judge of Revelation.

May 30.—The '*New Birth*;'—founded on the conversation of Jesus with Nichodemus.

June 6.—The meaning of preaching '*Christ crucified*,' and in what sense it was 'a stumbling block' to the Jews, and 'foolishness' to the Greeks.

June 13.—The folly and wickedness of attempting to silence the enemies of Christianity by penal laws.

June 20.—Membership with the church of God indispensable to constitute the Christian character—with the nature and advantages of such membership.

June 27—Miracles a test of the divine mission of a Prophet or Teacher.

THE

FREETHINKING

CHRISTIANS'

QUARTERLY REGISTER.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE FALL OF MAN DISPROVED.

By an Explanation of the Fifth Chapter of the Romans.

ESSAY IV.

HAVING shewn in our former papers that the three first chapters of Genesis contain nothing more than a simple narrative of the conduct of our first parents, and of the dealings of God with them in the infancy of their existence—and that the whole account, when properly explained, is perfectly consistent with the wisdom and benevolence of Deity, and suited to the nature and circumstances of the beings he had formed—we still adhere to the opinion stated in our last, that any use that might be made of this account by the apostle Paul, could not alter or change the import of the original; and that if there should be found any apparent difference between what we may denominate the *text* of Moses and the *commentary* of Paul, the cause must rest either on the want of perspicuity in the writer, or of perspicacity in ourselves, inasmuch as Paul does not, in his remarks on the subject, profess to speak from inspiration, but merely reasons from the record which we have already examined in the Old Testament. But that no possible doubt may remain, we purpose noticing those passages in the New Testament, which are supposed to teach a different doctrine; and feel

confident that, to every candid mind, we shall make it appear evident, that the apostle Paul viewed the matter in the same light as we have done. It is a remarkable fact, that throughout the Old Testament this subject is never, either directly or indirectly, referred to, except in the three first chapters of Genesis. Even Jesus himself, who, it is said, came to repair the ruins of the fall, is perfectly silent on the subject; neither do any of the apostles, Paul excepted, ever, either directly or indirectly, refer to it, and *he* only in five places, which it is our object to show, give no support to the generally received doctrines of the fall of man; and make no reference to the sin of Adam, as the cause of man's iniquity (which, indeed, would but palliate his offences) but, on the contrary, every man's sins are there charged upon himself, and he is represented as the more responsible, inasmuch as he ought to have known and acted better. Nothing is said of our becoming mortal in consequence of Adam's transgression, nor any the most distant allusion made to what is called the first prophecy of the Messiah—the seed of the woman bruising the head of the serpent, but both Jesus and Paul, instead of this, always refer the fulfilment of the promises of God to the seed of the man, that is, of Abraham; and the promise made to him, that in him, and in his seed, should "*all the "families of the earth be blessed;*" and Jesus, so far from laying claim to this title, as being the seed of the woman, who was to bruise the serpent's head, states himself to be of the seed of David, and his apostles always refer to him as such. Surely if Jesus had been this promised seed of the woman, either he or his apostles would have referred to this prophecy in support of his claim to be the Messiah; but, in spite of the absence of all authority, and of the declaration of God himself, men still persist in believing that man is a fallen creature, in consequence of the sin of Adam; some maintaining that it entailed upon him and his posterity—death *temporal*, death *spiritual*, and death *eternal;* whereas it is a curious fact and well worthy of attention, that although Adam, in his state of innocence and supposed moral perfection, yielded to the first temptation and sinned against his Creator, thereby involving, as it is said, all his posterity in misery and ruin; yet that after his fall—after his nature became depraved, his mind darkened, and his heart corrupted—we never read of any sin he was guilty of, though placed in more trying circumstances. The baneful consequences said to result from the sin of Adam, have appeared to others, professing, indeed, more rational views, so inconsistent with reason, and so de-

rogatory to the character of God, that they have sought for a different solution: they have conceived it would be altogether cruel and unjust that such dreadful consequences, *in the way of punishment*, should fall on the posterity of Adam, who could have had no part in the transgression; but, taking it for granted that Adam's fall was, in some way or other, to affect his descendants, they have concluded that he was originally created immortal, but that, by his transgression, he became mortal, and, as a natural and necessary consequence, all his posterity, who would otherwise have been immortal, became like himself also mortal. If this explanation lessens the difficulty in any degree it does not certainly remove it; for if it be unjust to lay a heavy punishment upon one for the sin of another, it must he equally unjust to inflict a lighter, or any at all; the difference can only be in degree, not in the principle of the thing, and for this opinion we have the authority of Jesus himself (Luke xvi. 10)—"*He "that is unjust in the least is unjust also in much;*" it may be reckoned indeed a small injustice only, that we should forfeit immortality by the sin of Adam. As compared with the other system it may indeed appear so; but if it be true that, but for his sin, we should have enjoyed uninterrupted health, happiness, and an unending life; that we, who, could have no part in his offence, have thus been deprived of all those advantages and subjected to all the various ills that flesh is heir to, and that we shall finally be exposed to death, certainly it would appear no small punishment, no very trifling injustice on the part of that being who inflicted these things. But we have said, that men maintain this absurd and revolting system, not only in the absence of all authority, from Moses and the prophets to Jesus and his apostles, but in contradiction to the express declaration of God himself. Let us now proceed to establish this position; and if we succeed in doing *this*, we may with perfect safety leave our opponents to settle the difference—not with us but with the Bible.

In the second commandment Jehovah, speaking of himself, declares—"*For I am a jealous God, visiting the sins "of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth "generation of them that hate me,*" &c. Now this has appeared so unjust to the enemies of divine revelation, that its advocates, even the orthodox themselves, have been obliged to find a solution that should vindicate the conduct and character of the Most High; which they have done, and certainly most effectually, by shewing that when he represents himself as visiting the sins of the fathers on

the children to the *third* and *fourth* generation of those who hate him, and as shewing mercy to *thousands* of (generations) of those who love him and keep his commandments; it is only to shew that his mercies are comparatively to his punishments as 1000 to 4. This explanation, though perhaps perfectly correct, is not necessary to clear the character of Deity; for, as every thing is under his direction and controul, every thing may be said to be done by him, yet we know, without any immediate interference of Deity, that it is a very natural consequence that wicked parents should entail upon their children, and even their children's children, great evils both moral and physical—the necessary results of their own criminal pursuits. But if it would appear unjust for Deity to punish the children to the fourth generation for the sins of their parents, how much more unjust would it be that he should, agreeably to the doctrine of original sin, visit the sin of our father Adam who, it does not appear, *did* hate him, on *all* generations! And, if the declaration of God in the second commandment, is to be taken as a criterion of his conduct to his creatures, we might conclude that, when all the descendants of Adam were destroyed, except Noah and his family, Noah having loved God, and being declared to be a righteous man, the sin of Adam would have been obliterated, and the descendants of Noah be blessed, instead of cursed, to a thousand generations. The same, also, we should expect would have been the case with Abraham and his posterity: and, therefore, we might conclude that, instead of suffering for the original sin of Adam, we should all be blessed for the more recent righteousness of Noah and Abraham.

Having made these prefatory remarks we shall now proceed to attempt an explanation of those passages which have been considered as supporting the doctrine we have been exposing—and first, Rom. v. 12 to end. In explaining this chapter it may be necessary to use some degree of prolixity; not, indeed, from the difficulty of the subject itself, but from the very imperfect manner in which it is translated; the truth of this assertion requires no other proof than the many supplements introduced into the text by the translators, more, perhaps, than in any other part of the New Testament, and the very great difficulty all persons experience in giving an improved translation of it; beside which it is to be recollected that those who translated our common version all believed in the fall of man in Adam; and that even

those who have attempted an improved translation have believed that man became mortal in consequence of Adam's transgression. We have, therefore, good reason to believe that they would each feel a strong bias to translate it accordingly. Mr. Belsham, it appears, is of opinion that the account in Genesis is a fiction, that the apostle reasoned upon it without vouching for its truth; but though it be a fiction in Mr. B.'s opinion, yet he supposes the apostle's conclusions are correct, and that in consequence of Adam's sin all his posterity became mortal, which they would not otherwise have been.

Differing as we do from this learned and frequently enlightened authority we proceed to the chapter under consideration. It will, we believe, be allowed by all parties that all the previous part of the epistle down to this twelfth verse contains a regular series of argument—a connected chain of reasoning—to prove that all men, both Jews and Gentiles, had sinned, and came short of the glory of God; that none of them had any claim to his favour by their previous obedience, and that, therefore, there was only one way, and that equally necessary and open to all, whereby they could obtain pardon for past sins, or be admitted into the divine favour. He first shews the gentile world that they not only had perverted the original knowledge of God, which they had derived from their forefathers to whom God had communicated it, but also acted contrary to those principles on which they were in the habit of reasoning, or judging between themselves, either in approving or condemning the actions of others; and that, therefore, they, though without a written law, were a law unto themselves, and that even by that law they must stand condemned. To the Jew he urges their violation of the written law, and shews, notwithstanding all their advantages and boast, that they were equally in a state of condemnation with the heathen, and must obtain salvation on the same terms and conditions as was offered to them. For after establishing, in the first chapter, that the gentiles, who had no written law, had been guilty of every crime, and that they were all in a state of condemnation, he addresses himself in the thirty-second verse to the Jew whom he shews to be equally in a state of condemnation, because he knew (that which the heathen did not know, having no written law) "*that they who "commit such things are worthy of death; not only do the same, "but have pleasure in those who do them.*" He then goes on to shew the iniquity of the Jewish people, and proves it to have been always the same, by quotations from their sacred writers;

and, in chap. iii. 9, he sums up the matter by saying—"*What then? are we better than they? No; for I have before "proved both Jews and Gentiles that they are both under sin.*" This was the first point he was seeking to establish—viz. to prove that all men—Jews and Gentiles—in all ages, had sinned and come short of the glory of God; that all were in a state of condemnation, and none could claim anything of Deity, but as a matter of grace and favour, and in the way and manner he saw fit. And here we may observe that, clearly as the apostle establishes his case, as to the state of sin, and consequent condemnation of the Jewish and gentile world, he might have spared himself a most laboured process of reasoning, by referring to the fact of all being rendered condemned sinners by the single transgression of Adam; and we may conclude that his omitting to do so in the premises he had been thus carefully laying down, is an evidence not only that he was ignorant of such an opinion, but that he had no intention of raising such an inference from the premises he had established. Having proved, not by reference to the sin of Adam, but by the fact of the actual transgression of Jew and Gentile, that all were in a state of condemnation, he proceeds to show what is the ground of acceptance with God, and the way in which it is to be obtained, (verse 20)—"*Therefore by "the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified in his "sight: FOR BY THE LAW IS THE KNOWLEDGE OF SIN. "But NOW the righteousness*" (or benignity) "*of God without "the law is manifested, being witnessed by the law and the "prophets; even the righteousness*" (benignity) "*of God, "which is by faith of Jesus the Christ unto all*" (both Jews and Gentiles) "*and upon all them that believe: FOR THERE "IS NO DIFFERENCE: for all have sinned and come short "of the glory of God being justified freely by his favour "through the redemption*" (or deliverance from sin) "*that is "in the Christ Jesus:*" (declared by him) "*whom God hath "set forth to be a propitiation*" (or mercy seat) "*through "faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness*" (benignity) "*for the remission of SINS THAT ARE PAST, through the "forbearance of God;*" (not through the atonement of Jesus) "*to declare, I say, at this time, his righteousness:*" (benignity) "*that he might be just, and the justifier of him that believeth "in Jesus. Where is boasting then? It is excluded. By what "law? of works? Nay; but by the law of faith. Therefore "we conclude that a man is justified by faith without the deeds "of the law.*" Having thus established the point that all

have sinned—that all need forgiveness—that there is but one way, by which all must obtain it, and that way is faith—he goes on to show, in the next chapter, what the nature of that faith and that justification is, of which he has been treating; and illustrates it by the example of Abraham, and the declarations of David; and further to establish the right of the gentiles to participate in the benefit of the gospel, he shews that the Deity had most effectually provided for the same, by justifying Abraham for his faith, or dependance on him, before he was circumcised; and adds—"*Therefore it is of faith, that it may be by grace;*" (favour) "*to the end that the promise might be sure to all the* "*seed; not to that only which is of the law, but to that also* "*which is of the faith of Abraham, who is the father of us all.*" Having established the right of the Gentile to participate equally with the Jew in all the advantages of the gospel, and that by faith alone, he says, chap. v.—"*Therefore being* "*justified by faith, we have peace with God, through our* "*Lord Jesus the Christ; by whom we*" (Jews or Gentiles) "*have access by faith unto this grace*" (favour) "*wherein we* "*stand, and rejoice in hope of the glory of God.*" He then proceeds to shew the goodness of God in these advantages conferred, and says that "*God commendeth his love towards* "*us, in that, while we were yet sinners, in due time the Christ* "*died for us.*"—"*For if, when we were enemies, we were re-* "*conciled*" (or a foundation laid for our reconciliation) "*to* "*God by the death of his son, much more, being*" (actually) "*reconciled, we shall be saved by his life. And not only so,*" (are we reconciled) "*but we also joy in God, through our* "*Lord Jesus the Christ, by whom we have now received the* "*atonement:*" * (reconciliation.)

The apostle having fully established the points he had been labouring to prove—that all mankind had sinned in all ages; that none could obtain forgiveness but by the divine benignity; and that, through faith, all were equally entitled to participate who would accept the proffered mercy; that it was by faith alone that they could have access to this favour; and, that having obtained it, they were not only pardoned the sins which were past, but

* Here we would observe that if any one should consider this word, atonement, as giving sanction to the calvinistic doctrine of atonement, two things are deserving their attention—First, That this is the only place in the New Testament, where the word is so translated; and Secondly, That it is the believers and not God who are said to have received the atonement.

permitted to rejoice in hope of the glory of God—he proceeds to sum up the evidence, to state the conclusion, and to illustrate, by different arguments, the nature and extent of the divine intentions; shewing, that all mankind, even from the very first man, had sinned, that all, as he had before proved, had followed his example, and were, therefore, in a state of condemnation, from which they could not escape but by the free grace and favour of God, as made known by Jesus and the apostles, and which was now offered to Jews and Gentiles without distinction—without regard to their former conduct, but only upon the like obedience of faith on which Abraham had been formerly justified.

With these prefatory remarks and explanations, we now come to the all-important passage on which the advocates of orthodoxy build their strongest dependance—"*Wherefore, as by one man sin entered into the world, and* "*death by sin; and so death hath passed upon* ALL *men, for* "ALL *have sinned.*" Now let it be remarked that in this place the apostle does not adduce any *new* fact, or lay down any *new principle;* it is (as the term "*Wherefore,*" by which it is introduced, clearly indicates) merely the winding up, or rather conclusion, of all which he had been arguing before; we must, therefore, not explain his previous observations by this verse, but this verse by his previous reasoning, and in so doing we shall be able to ascertain what is the precise meaning of the words sin and death.* Now, in reading over the previous chapters, it must be clear to every one, as we have already intimated, and now distinctly repeat, that Paul never says anything concerning man having been made mortal or a sinner, or liable to death, and the judgment of God, for, or in consequence of, the sin of Adam; his object throughout being to prove that all have *themselves* actually sinned, and that they were in a state of condemnation for their actual guilt; for he shews that even the heathen world were without excuse, inasmuch as they did not retain God in their knowledge, God therefore gave them over to a reprobate mind, and that *not* because they were naturally corrupt and subject to sin and death for Adam's transgression, but because of their own wickedness; and the Jew he represents as in a similar case,

* See Rom. i. 32; v. 15; vi. 16, 22, 23; vii. 5, 9, 10; viii. 1, 9; 2 Cor. iii. 7, 9; James i. 15.

because he not only had all the advantage which the heathen possessed, but had also a written law which he had also transgressed; and this line of argument was in all points essential to the apostle's object, which was expressly to prove that all had sinned and come short of the glory of God, and to justify the conduct of God in placing all on an equal footing "*that every mouth may be stopped,*" *and all the world become guilty before God, and receive justification by faith alone.* As it regards the word *sin*, it must be evident it means the actual sin of the party and not the imputed sin of Adam; for the apostle says, (i. 18)—"*For the wrath* "*of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness* "*and unrighteousness* OF MEN, *who hold the truth in un-* "*righteousness;*" and ii. 12—"*For as many as have sinned* "*without law, shall perish without law: and as many as have* "*sinned in the law, shall be judged by the law.*" Now had death or condemnation come upon man in any shape or form for the sin of Adam, all these distinctions would have been superfluous; for whether with law, or without, all would suffer, whether they had sinned or not, because of Adam's transgression: and as it respects the word *death*, it is clear the writer means here, as in many other cases, that they were in a state of condemnation; and that they could by no means be delivered from it, as the consequence of their sins, but by the free grace or favour of God; as, whatever were their state or condition before, whether they had the law or were without it, sin, in its own nature and consequences, was the same; and, however the days of their ignorance God had winked at, yet they were now without excuse, seeing he now commanded men every where to repent; and, as in chap. i. 18, the wrath of God was said to be revealed from heaven against all unrighteousness—and the apostle had proved all under sin—the word death must mean that all were in a state of condemnation, and under sentence of death, because all had sinned and come short of the glory of God; and that this is the meaning is evident from Rom. viii. 1. "*There is, therefore, now no condemnation to them that* "*are in Christ Jesus;*" here evidently shewing that what they had been delivered from, under the name of death, was a state of condemnation, having sinned against God, the penalty of which was death, and they of course lay under its sentence. The object of chap. v. 12 is then to sum up the whole. He had before been labouring to prove that, from the very first, sin had been in the world; that Adam was the first sinner, to whom death as a penalty for sin, was first

threatened; that all his posterity had followed his example, and all had sinned; and, by parity of reasoning, all, like him, were in a state of transgression and consequent condemnation; for, let it be observed, he does not say—wherefore as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin, so death passed upon all men because *one* had sinned. Had he so done he would have completely destroyed not only his previous argument, but the very object he had in view—viz. that all, both Jew and Gentile, had *actually* sinned; *that every mouth might be stopped, and all the world become guilty before God*—but by saying one man introduced sin, and death entered into the world because *all* had sinned, is in perfect agreement with both his argument and his object.* To enforce this argument as to the universality of sin and condemnation, and also to obviate an objection that might be made respecting those who were not favoured with a written law, the writer says (verse 13)—"*For until "the law"* (even between the time of this first man and the giving of the law) "*sin was in the world: but sin is not "imputed"* (or reckoned, see Locke) "*when there is no law.*" Now the first question that arises on this passage is, by whom was sin not imputed? The advocates of orthodoxy assert by the Deity; and *that* in opposition to all the apostle's previous reasoning to prove that all were morally guilty of actual transgression and subject to condemnation, whether with the law or without it; but, independent of this, such an assertion that God did not, at that period, impute sin to those who had no law, would be contrary to fact, and the declaration of God himself. Did not God impute sin to those he destroyed by a flood?—To the people of Sodom?—To the Canaanitish nations? And did he not punish all these accordingly? Seeing then that the apostle cannot mean that God did not impute sin, to whom does the writer refer? Surely to man himself; for it is only by the law that men arrive at the knowledge of sin, see chapters vi. vii. "*Nay, I had not known sin but by the law; for I had not known "lust"* (or evil desire—to be sin) "*except the law had said "thou shalt not covet.*" And again, verse 9—"*For I was "alive without the law once; but when the commandment came*

* It certainly is one of the most extravagant perversions of words to infer that because the apostle says death passed upon all men, for (or because) *all* had sinned, he therefore means that this death had passed upon all men because only *one* had sinned.

"*sin revived*" (appeared in its proper colours) "*and I died:*" (or found that, according to law, I was condemned to death) "*and the commandment which was ordained to life*" (had I kept it) "*I found to be unto death,*" (because I had not kept it.) We may perhaps illustrate this point by a reference to our West India Colonies, in which there is no law which makes it a capital offence to kill a slave; although it is accounted a crime deserving of death to take away the life of a white man. Is then the murder of a slave less heinous than the murder of a white man, either as to its moral guilt, or in the judgment of God? Certainly not; yet, because there is *no law* which says it is worthy of death, they do not *impute* it, reckon it, or carry it to account in the absence of such law; they, like the heathen, might plead they had not sinned against law, but to them the reply would be equally just; you shall be judged in the absence of law by your own reasonings among yourselves—viz. that to take away the life of a white man is deserving of death, and, as in the sight of the Deity all colours are equal, so you prove yourselves, by such reasoning, worthy of death though you had no law, and are therefore a law unto yourselves. Now the apostle's argument is to this effect—that sin was in the world even when there was no law, and its moral consequences were the same; though, because there was no written law, accurately describing it and the penalty attached to it, men did not impute to it the character it deserved, they did not *impute*, reckon, or carry it to account; but, notwithstanding their thus not taking account of it, the effects on their moral character, and their total unfitness to claim the divine favour on account of their works, were the same, and they were equally with those who held the law in a state of condemnation; and the apostle thus argues, verse 14—where, after having shewn that sin was in the world before the law was given, though men did not carry it to account, he says—"*Nevertheless,*" (though they did not impute it) "*death*" (or condemnation) "*reigned from Adam*
"*to Moses, even over them who had not sinned after the simili-*
"*tude of Adam's transgression,*" (that is, had not violated a positive law.) The apostle having established what it was his grand object to prove—that all mankind, whether with or without a written law, were all guilty before God, in a state of condemnation; and that all being thus situated, there was on other way for them to escape its consequences but by submitting to the plan proposed by Deity through Jesus, which he had proved to be open and free to all who chose

to embrace it—now proceeds to shew that not only all may, but that all eventually shall derive advantage from it. He shews that as one man, Adam, was the first that introduced sin, and all men had followed his example, and thereby were all in a state of condemnation; so that another man, Jesus, the first of *his* race, who was perfectly righteous, should by his example and precepts, and the doctrine he taught, deliver all men from condemnation, and make them eventually like himself—all righteous.

At the latter part of the fourteenth verse the apostle states—That Adam was a figure of him that was to come, and endeavours to draw a kind of parallel between the acts of each, and the consequences resulting from the conduct of each, by saying, verse 15—"*But not as the offence, so is the free-gift. For "if through the offence of one man"* (by following his example) "*many*" (or all) "*be dead;*" (in a state of condemnation) "*much more the grace*" (favour) "*of God, and "the gift,*" (of pardon) "*which is by one man, Jesus the "Christ, hath abounded to*" (the same) "*many.*" Now here let it be observed, that as the acceptance of pardon, and the favour of God, through Jesus, could only be obtained by the man's own voluntary act; so, to make the cases parallel, the apostle cannot mean to say that men became sinners because of Adam's sin, but because they voluntarily transgressed as he had done. Having drawn a parellel betwixt Adam and Jesus, and shewn that each of them were the first in a new series of things, he goes on to contrast the consequences, and to shew that great as were the evils the one had introduced, much greater would be the benefit conferred on mankind by the system of which the other was the introducer; for (verse 16) he says, not indeed as our translation has it, but as it ought to be rendered, and the marginal reading, in verses 17 and 18 confirms the idea—"*For if by* (for) *one offence death "reigned by* (for) *one;* (sin) *much more,*" &c. And verse 18—"*Therefore, as by* (for) *one offence judgment came upon "all men to condemnation; even so, by one act of righteousness, "the free-gift came upon all men to justification of life.*" For it is to be observed the writer is not here drawing a parallel between one man as the first sinner, and the other as the first truly righteous person, but he is shewing that the free gift by Jesus, greatly exceeded every thing arising from the condemnation men had brought on themselves by transgression, inasmuch as men were in a state of condemnation for one offence; whereas the

free gift was not pardon only for *one* but for *all* the offences men had ever committed. This idea we may illustrate as follows:—By the law of the land forgery is punished with death. Now referring to the individual first guilty of this crime, and all others who had followed his example, but against whom, for some wise purpose, the sentence of death was not carried into execution, although they were still amenable to death, it might with great propriety be said—" By one man forgery entered into the nation, and death by the sin of forgery, and so death passed upon all (all became amenable to death) because all have forged;" no man in his senses would infer because one man by forging had made himself subject to death, that the others having done the same were therefore condemned on *his* account. Let us further suppose an offer of pardon to be made to all who had been proved guilty of the crime of forgery, and not only for that offence, but for all others, that they might have been guilty of, it might with propriety be said, *but not as the offence, so is the free gift of pardon*, the judgment was for one offence only—forgery; but the free gift extends far beyond this in pardoning *all* offences, however numerous they may have been. Such appears then to be the object of the apostle's reasoning in this place. God had threatened Adam with death, for *one* act of disobedience: he disobeyed, and was legally under a sentence of death, though it was never executed;* he it was, then, who first sinned; he it was, that caused death to be pronounced, for one offence. His posterity were under the same law, and for one offence, if they had committed no more, would have been legally in a state of condemnation; for, says the apostle James, ii. 10. " *Whosoever shall keep the whole law*," (beside) " *and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all.*" Paul had proved that all had sinned, not only in one instance but to a most enormous extent; and his object is now to show that if the law condemned for one offence, the free gift of pardon extended to all offences. From the connection then, and object of the apostle's argument, as well as from a comparison of the marginal readings, and the suggestions of modern translators, the passage we submit may clearly be rendered as follows; " *and not as it was FOR ONE*

* Adam it is true died, but this was a *natural* death, which being, as we have seen in our former papers, the condition of his being could not be the punishment of his offence; the death threatened, but not executed, was an *immediate*—a *sudden* death.

"*sin, so is the gift, for the judgment was for* ONE" (sin) "*to* "*condemnation, but the free-gift is of* MANY" (all) "OFFENCES, "*unto justification,*" and to confirm this he adds, verse 17, "*for if by*" (or for) "*one offence, death*" (or condemnation to death) "*reigned by*" (or for) "*one offence,* * *much more they* "*which receive abundance of grace,*" (favour) "*and of the gift* "*of righteousness,*" (justification) "*shall reign in life by one*" (or following the example of one) "*Jesus the Christ.*" (verse 18.) "*Therefore as by*" (or for) "*one offence* † *judgment came* "*upon all men to condemnation even so by one* ‡" (act of) "*righteousness, the true gift came upon all men*" (who comply with the conditions) "*unto justification of life;*" that is to say, as for one offence men became subject to death; so by one act of righteousness, viz. faith in Jesus, they received pardon of their sins; were freed from previous condemnation, and were justified from all their former sins. That this one act of righteousness is faith in God, and belief in his messenger, is clear from chapters iii. and iv. "*Abraham* "*believed God, and it was accounted to him for righteousness;*" and again, verse 6, "*even as David also describeth the blessed-* "*ness of the man, to whom God imputeth righteousness without* "*works.*" Here then it is evident, that it is not for the righteousness of Jesus that men are justified, but for their own act of faith, which is accounted to them, as it was to Abraham, for righteousness, and on this account they are justified and placed in the blessed situation described by David, as persons to whom God imputeth righteousness without works; in other terms as he expresses it—"*to whom the* "*Lord will not impute sin;*" the apostle then carries his ideas further to show, that not only should those who had like Adam sinned, be pardoned—be imputed righteous; but as all had become actually sinners, following the example of one man's disobedience, so all, the same all who had sinned, should, by following the example of obedience set by Jesus, be made not only imputatively, but really, and actually righteous, and this he expresses in the following emphatic language; verse 19, "*for as by*" (or through) "*one man's disobedience, many*" (all) "*were* "*made*" (or became) "*sinners,*" (by following his example) "*so by*" (or through) "*the obedience of one shall many*" (all) "*be made*" (or become) "*righteous.*" (By imitating his

* See marginal reading, Wakefield and Belsham.

† See margin. ‡ See margin.

obedience.). And then—as though he would shew that there was no extent to which men might have sinned, but what the free gift of pardon was designed to reach—he adds, verses 20 and 21, "*Moreover, the law entered* "*that sin might abound, but where sin abounded, grace*" (favour) "*did much more abound, that as sin hath reigned* "*unto death,*" (the condemnation of all) "*even, so might* "*grace*" (favour) "*reign through righteousness,*" (justification) "*unto eternal life*" (over the same all) "*by*" (or through) "*Jesus the Christ and our Lord.*" It must be clear, we apprehend, to every one that the apostle could not mean that the law was introduced for the purpose of increasing the quantum of sin, and making that, which was already too much, greater on account of the law; this would indeed be to contradict our reason, and the declaration of the writer himself, vii. 9, 10, 12, 13, which explains most clearly, what is intended in this place by the terms, "*That the law entered, that sin might abound.*"—"*For* "*I was alive without the law once: but when the com-* "*mandment came, sin revived,*" (shewed itself in all its odious consequences) "*and I died; and the commandment,* "*which was ordained to life, I found to be unto death:*" (condemnation.) "*Wherefore the law is holy; and the* "*commandment holy, and just, and good. Was then that* "*which is good made death unto me? God forbid.* BUT SIN, "THAT IT MIGHT APPEAR SIN, *working death in me by* "*that which is good, that sin by the commandment might* "*become*" (or appear) *exceeding sinful.*" From these verses, and the previous context, it should appear, that the apostle, having shewn the extent of divine favour to believers in Jesus, and that unlike the law, which condemned for one offence, it embraced the multitude of offences—he shews in this verse, that the original design of the law was to manifest the utmost extent to which men had sinned, and to bring to light all those offences, which would not otherwise have been recognized as immoral, and a violation of law; as he has said, verse 13, "*until the law,* "*sin was in the world:*" and yet, as we have previously explained, men did not *impute* or carry it to account; and chap. vii. 7, "*I had not known sin, but by the law: for I had not* "*known lust,*" (or evil desire, to be sin) "*except the law had* "*said thou shalt not covet.*" From all these considerations, it must appear, that the entering of the law was for the purpose of making sin appear exceeding sinful, to show it in all its baneful consequences, its condemning power, and in its fullest

extent; but that, however great this might be, he assures us in the following sentence, that the grace and favour of God, is more than sufficient to deliver his creatures from all its consequences. "*But where sin abounded,*" (as manifested by the law) "*grace*" (or favour) "*did much* "*more abound: that as sin has reigned unto death,*" (or the condemnation of all) "*even so might grace reign, through* "*righteousness,*" (justification) "*unto eternal life,*" (over the same all) "*by Jesus the Christ and our Lord.*" Here then the apostle has throughout the whole of his argument, commencing at the first chapter, to this grand and glorious conclusion, taught that although all have sinned, and are in a state of condemnation, that although the law was intended to exhibit, and to evidence this condemnation, yet that God, in his infinite wisdom and benevolence, had so ordained and provided the means, that all his creatures should eventually be delivered from condemnation, and be made righteous, wise, and happy.

If then the three first chapters of Genesis be of a kind to shew that what they record is no fiction, but a rational narrative of facts, perfectly consistent with the divine attributes, and accordant with the nature and peculiar circumstances of our first parents, (and we have no doubt the apostle so considered it) so we are of opinion that the explanation now offered of the apostle's reasoning, is in perfect accordance with those facts, with the whole history of man, and the dealings of God with him, as recorded in the sacred writings. We leave the subject for the present, but shall proceed in our next to examine such other passages in the writings of the apostle Paul, as have any reference thereto. Convinced, as we are, that the doctrine of the fall of man—of the depravity of human nature—has no better foundation in the reasonings of the New than in the facts of the Old Testament—that such a view of human nature, as the workmanship of heaven, is in fact unauthorised by Revelation, contrary to experience and philosophy, derogatory to God, and pernicious in its moral consequences to man.

THE CONDUCT OF DAVID, IN DANCING BEFORE THE ARK, EXPLAINED AND DEFENDED.

2 Samuel, chap. vi. 14th to 16th verse.—"*And David* DANCED *before the Lord with all his might; and David was girded with a linen ephod. So David and all the house of Israel brought up the ark of the Lord with shouting, and with the sound of the trumpet. And as the ark of the Lord came into the city of David, Michal, Saul's daughter, looked through a window and saw king David* LEAPING *and* DANCING *before the Lord; and* SHE DESPISED *him in her heart.*" Verses 20 to 23.—"*Then David returned to bless his household; and Michal, the daughter of Saul, came out to meet David, and said how glorious was the king of Israel to-day, who* UNCOVERED HIMSELF TO DAY IN THE EYES OF THE HANDMAIDS *of his servants, as one of the* VILE FELLOWS SHAMELESSLY UNCOVERETH *himself! And David said unto Michal it was before the Lord, which chose me before thy father and before all his house, to appoint me ruler over the people of the Lord over Israel; therefore will I play before the Lord. And I will yet be* MORE VILE *than thus, and will be* BASE *in mine own sight; and of the maid servants which thou has spoken of, of them shall I be had in honour.*"

ALTHOUGH the moral conduct of David does not in any way affect, and cannot impeach the truth of Revelation, it would undoubtedly lessen our regard for the Jewish scriptures if they could fairly be accused of recording instances of immoral and flagitious conduct in the lives of their heroes, without accompanying such statements with marked and just reprobation. No character that is recorded in the ancient scriptures has perhaps been more calumniated, and less understood, by the enemies to revealed religion, than that of David; and although it is not our present intention to enter on a general defence of the character of David, we venture to express our conviction that a candid examination of his life and reign, making due allowances for the customs, manners, and state of morals of the times and country in which he lived, would prove that, as a prince, he was wise, just, and truly magnanimous; that, as a man, he possessed great excellence of character, not unalloyed, indeed, with defects, but which defects are recorded in the scriptures, without any attempt at concealment, and admitted by himself in the bitterest terms of self-reproach, and free from all extenuation!

The particular incident in the life of this truly great and deservedly popular prince, which is to be found in the verses above quoted, has given occasion to great scandal against the scriptures; and the objection has been rendered familiar

to the public by a treatise reprinted by the Carlisles, and entitled "The Life of David;" a work (from the pen, we believe, of the celebrated Annett) abounding in artful misrepresentation, and well calculated to mislead the unwary, and weaken the faith of those who have not been accustomed to deep thinking on subjects connected with religion. The circumstance in the history of David, which it is our present intention to examine, is, by the work in question, made to assume a character of indecency which it would be improper to copy into our pages; and it is not difficult to see, from the perusal of the verses which head this article, that, where the mind is so disposed, there are expressions in the text which may afford a colourable pretext for such a representation. The question to be decided is, did David, on this occasion, act a low, a degrading, and an indecent part, disgraceful to him as a man, and unworthy of him as a prince? To determine this question let us first call the attention of the reader to the particular circumstances in which David, at this period, was placed.

The dynasty of Israel had but recently been changed, and the royal sceptre was now swayed by David; a powerful party still adhered to the house of Saul, and the new monarch in all his measures appears desirous of becoming a popular prince, and of extinguishing the embers of discord, and of faction, by the prudence of his councils, and the virtue of his public conduct; on which conduct, in fact, the attention of the whole nation was now fastened. From a comparison of the concurrent records presented by the Book of Samuel, and the Chronicles, it would appear that, during the reign of Saul, the Mosaic religion had fallen into neglect; its institutions were disregarded; its priesthood was scattered; and the sacred ark, or coffer, in which was deposited the Jewish law, and which was connected with so many important recollections to a people who had been led in so signal a manner by the Divine Power, was suffered to remain in a distant part of the country, unhallowed and unnoticed. To remedy these evils, and to restore the Mosaic religion in the purity of its principles, with all the imposing solemnity of its forms, and the political wisdom of its institutions, appear to have been an important object with David at the commencement of his reign. "*And David consulted with the captains of thousands and* "*hundreds, and with every leader. And David said unto all* "*the congregation of Israel if it seem good unto you, and that* "*it be of the Lord our God, let us send abroad unto our*

*" brethren every where, that are left in all the land of Israel " and with them also to the priests and levites which are in their " cities and suburbs, that they may gather themselves unto us. " AND LET US BRING AGAIN THE ARK OF OUR GOD TO US " FOR WE INQUIRED NOT AT IT IN THE DAYS OF SAUL."** (1 Chron. xiii. 1—3.) At such a time, with such objects, and surrounded by such circumstances, it is that David is supposed to have acted a publicly disgraceful, indecent, and scandalous part; and this not only without motive and without object, but *against*, in fact, all the motives and objects by which he was manifestly actuated at the time, and which it was so much his *interest* to keep in view! If, however, the very circumstances of the case nullify, as we contend they do, the charge which is made to arise out of them, do they not also lead to, and superinduce an explanation which shall exhibit the transaction in question as honourable to the character of David, and well calculated to raise him in the estimation of the people?

The reader of Jewish history will have had frequent occasions of noticing the religious importance attached by the Jews to the ark of the covenant. Without undertaking to explain the difficulties, or to anticipate the objections which may by some be supposed to attach to the history of the sacred ark, it may be observed that the splendid and imposing forms of idolatrous worship appear generally to have suggested the ceremonial of the Jewish religion; and thus, by a wise accommodation to existing prejudice, was the worship of the one invisible God, and an adherence to the principles of moral duty, rendered acceptable to the Jewish people, when surrounded with all " the pomp and circumstance" of those idolatrous forms of worship, to which, in common with the neighbouring nations, they had been accustomed. So close, indeed, is the resemblance between the religious observances and ceremonies of the Egyptians in particular, and those of the Jews, as to have led some writers into the error of supposing that the Egyptians copied their ceremonies from the Jews; the reverse, however, there can be little doubt, is the fact; and the religious importance attached by the disciples of Moses to the ark of the covenant, is but an illustration of this general position. In the religious processions of Egypt it appears† there was a

* Barker's Bible—" For we sought not unto it," &c. The Hebrew—" We inquired not about it."

† See Fragments to Calmet's Dictionary.

chest-bearer, whose business was to carry a box containing certain costly articles for their religious uses. The Trojans also, with the Greeks and the Romans, had their *sacred chests*, in which were contained the mysteries of their religion; and, if any reliance is to be placed upon the uncertain lights which antiquarian research has been enabled to throw upon this confessedly difficult subject, there would seem reason to conclude that even the cherubim with which the Jewish ark was surmounted, bore a close resemblance to the emblematic animals of the Egyptians. Thus, then, the Jews retained in their religion the outward ceremonies and splendid forms which had rendered the worship of their former masters so attractive; but these ceremonies and these forms, in the one case, were subservient to the worship of the living God; and, in the other, a blind homage to dumb idols! The pagan ark contained those sublime or absurd mysteries which it was unlawful to inquire into. The Jewish ark was the depository of those enlightened moral commandments engraved on the Mosaic tablets, which had been publicly propounded to the whole people.

If any philosophic reader should here take exception to the forms and ceremonies of the Jewish ritual, he does only what the Jewish prophets and teachers themselves have done, who uniformly represent these outward rites as mean and unimportant on *their own account*. "The beggarly "elements of the law" were, in fact, an indulgence to a people whose dark minds, unless permitted to adore the God of Nature, and of truth, through the veil of outward ceremonies, would have been prostrated before the gods of human invention; and whose bodies would have been polluted by those immoralities which had been rendered sacred to their honour.

To increase, therefore, the reverential regard which, upon the principle now stated, it was so desirable should attach to the ark of the covenant among a nation so prone to idolatry as the Jews, was the object, the policy, if we may so speak, of the Mosaic law. Consistently with this object it is, then, that the ark was rendered the appropriate medium of miraculous interposition; and that David, among the first acts of his reign, should propose to restore it to its just importance with the people. So neglected, however, had been the ark in the days of Saul, that it would seem the mode of its conveyance upon the shoulders of the priests, as prescribed by the Mosaic law, had been forgotten; and the Divine displeasure had been indicated when David had

attempted its removal to his own city in a manner inconsistent with the respectful regard directed by the law. And now, when David is re-assured of the Divine favour as resting on his intentions, he appears to have studied to have made the occasion of the removal of the ark to a place more worthy of its importance, one of deep interest and importance to the people. The history of the removal of the ark from the house of Obed-edom, to the city of David, will show that this affair was regarded as of national importance —that it was a grand public procession—that solemn sacrifices, public rejoicing, and national festivity, distinguished the day of its occurrence. Thus, in the history immediately under examination, we are told that David brought up the ark of God "*into the city of David with gladness;*" that "*when they that bare the ark of the Lord had gone six paces* "*he sacrificed oxen and fatlings;*" that "*David and all the* "*house of Israel brought up the ark of the Lord with shouting* "*and with the sound of the trumpet;*" that "*they brought in* "*the ark of the Lord and set it in his place, in the midst of* "*the tabernacle that David had pitched for it, and David* "*offered burnt offerings and peace offerings before the Lord;*" that "*as soon as David had made an end of offering burnt* "*offerings and peace offerings he blessed the people in the name* "*of the Lord of Hosts, and he dealt among all the people, even* "*among the whole multitude of Israel as well to women as men,* "*to every one a cake of bread, and a good piece of flesh, and a* "*flagon of wine.*" And in the corresponding account in Chronicles, (1 Chron. chap. xv.) we find set forth at length, the complete order and *programme* of the procession; the vocal choir and instrumental band with which it was accompanied; not excepting, indeed, even the names of those who, on this memorable occasion, were appointed—whether for their skilfulness in song, or for their proficiency upon the cymbals of brass, the psalteries, the harp, or the trumpet. In this grand public procession what part does it appear that the newly appointed king of Israel acted? Does he behold the homage offered by his people to their God with proud, unsympathizing indifference; or does he not, as a monarch owing his throne to "God and the people," unite with that people in yielding an equal reverence to their equal God? Conscious that, before the King of Kings, all earthly distinctions are as nothing, he abases himself; he loses the king in the supplicant; he worships not as a monarch—but as a man. When the whole nation is animated by one general feeling of gratitude and joy,

David esteems it neither undignified nor unkingly to admit into his own bosom a respondent feeling, and to join with the people in giving one common expression to one common sentiment. The monarch casting aside the robes of royalty, joins with the people in the religious dance, the sacred music, and the solemn song. Such, at least, is our view of the case under consideration. But how, it may be asked, does this agree with the text? We answer that, with all the facts and circumstances of the record, it is in perfect agreement; and it requires only certain terms and forms of expression to be explained, and certain ancient usages to be borne in mind, to satisfy the reader that this view is the correct one.

The conduct of David upon this occasion, we have shown, was public, and open to the view of the whole nation. And who, let us mark, is it that takes any exception to that conduct? Not the historian; not the prophets or the priests; not any one of the assembled hosts of Israel; but *his wife*—the daughter of Saul, his late implacable enemy; the daughter of that Saul whose kingdom David had become possessed of, and whose family he had superseded. Michal, the wife of David, was not, indeed, without the kindly sensibilities of the sex; but she was, let it be remembered—*a legitimate!!* Bred up in courts, and accustomed to the example of the king her father—a man of proud, ambitious, and gloomy mind—it may be supposed that she could little understand, and was as little disposed to view favourably, that gracious condescension in the new monarch which is at once the privilege and the charm of real greatness. That our conjecture concerning the character of Michal is well founded may be confirmed by reference to the motives that had induced Saul to consent to the union of his daughter with David. "*And Michal, Saul's* "*daughter, loved David, and they told Saul, and* THE THING "PLEASED HIM; *and Saul said I will give him her* THAT "SHE MAY BE A SNARE UNTO HIM, *and that the hands of* "*the Philistines may be against him.*" (1 Sam. xviii. 20, 21.) Whilst, however, the affection which Michal bore towards David prevented her becoming the instrument of her father's treachery, it does not appear sufficient to have eradicated from her mind the prejudices of her court education; she avoids therefore participating in the national demonstration of sentiment on the removal of the ark, and secretly witnesses from a window that ceremony, which being designed to atone for the neglect of Saul, might, at the same time, be

construed into a reproach upon the memory of her father. It is then in the judgment only of *such a witness* that David stands accused. And what, let us inquire, is the nature of the accusation, and of the defence? David is not, as it is either ignorantly or artfully maintained, charged with any public indecency—with any breach of moral decorum—but with a departure from KINGLY DIGNITY. The accusation is in the nature of a *sarcasm*: "*And Michal, the daughter of* "*Saul, came out to meet David, and said how* GLORIOUS *was* "*the* KING OF ISRAEL *to-day, who uncovered himself to-day* "*in the eyes of the handmaids of his servants, as one of the* "VAIN FELLOWS *shamelessly uncovereth himself.*" Or as the old English and Geneva Bibles render it—"AS A FOOL *un-* "*covereth himself.*" That a reproach is only intended in these words against David, for acting what was esteemed by his wife a part derogatory to *the office* of the king, and such as was common to persons of low or mean extraction, is evident from the reply of David to this accusation. "*And David said unto Michal it was* BEFORE THE LORD, "*which chose me before thy father, and before all his house,* "*to appoint me ruler over the people of the Lord over Israel:* "THEREFORE *will I play* BEFORE THE LORD." Now had David acted with public indecency, it would rather have augmented than extenuated the offence that he had done so "*before the Lord;*" but if he was accused, as king of Israel, with forgetting his dignity, and bemeaning himself before the people, the answer is full of point—that it was *before the Lord* he had acted with this self-abasement. Indeed, to our judgment, this answer conveys a well-timed rebuke, both of the pride and jealousy of Michal; it is in substance thus:—"*The king of Israel is accused of forgetting the royal* "*dignity of his person in joining with his people in their* "*common demonstrations of public rejoicing; but I have done* "*so only upon an occasion of solemn importance, and before the* "*Sovereign of the Universe, who has raised me to the throne,* "*and who has preferred me to the father and family of mine* "*accuser. Penetrated with gratitude and humility I will there-* "*fore join with my people in praising the Lord, whether in the* "*dance or with the timbrel, with the harp or the stringed in-* "*struments.*" In this spirit of humility David adds, in the twenty-second verse—"*And I will yet be more vile than this,* "*and will be base in mine own sight; and of the maid servants* "*which thou hast spoken of, of them shall I be had in honour.*" The terms *vile* and *base*, which David applies in this verse to himself, require explanation. The first does not necessarily mean criminal, though frequently used in that sense;

thus the apostle, (Phil. iii. 21) speaking of our present mortal body, compared with man's future glorified state, terms it "*our vile body;*" and James describes the garb of the poor man as "*vile raiment.*" As to the term *base*, it may be sufficient to observe that the oldest English Bibles use the word *low*, instead of *base*, in the text. With these remarks the twenty-second verse is rendered in perfect keeping and consistency with the whole, as though David had said—"*I am on such an occasion free from all false shame; and* "*notwithstanding the imputed sneers of thy maid servants I* "*will still be more humble and lowly before my Maker, con-* "*scious that even by my misjudging and vain detractors I shall* "*finally be held in honour.*" It is added, in the concluding verse—"*Therefore Michal, the daughter of Saul, had no child* "*until the day of her death.*" Barrenness being esteemed a reproach among the Hebrew women, this condition is represented by the historian as a punishment upon Michal for her conduct; an evident proof this that she could not have been rebuking David for a really criminal act, but that she was reproaching him with that which was, in fact, honourable to his feelings, both as a man and a prince.

From an ignorance of eastern customs, a sense has been given to the expression, that David "*uncovered himself,*" which it was not intended by Michal to convey. Besides the *body-dress* which was common in the east, there was worn by all, except the commonality, an outward, loose flowing robe. The same custom prevailed among the Romans, who, when they went abroad, or upon public occasions, wore a long upper garment, called in the latin *toga*. This garment, upon many occasions, it became necessary to lay aside; and the language in which the state of the person is expressed, both by sacred and profane writers, when the outward garment is cast off, would seem to imply, to an English reader, a state of nudity, which, however, was contrary to the fact. Thus (John iii, 4) it is said of Jesus that "*he rose from supper and laid aside his garments;*" of Saul that "*he stripped off his clothes also and prophecied* "*before Samuel in like manner, and lay down* NAKED *all that* "*day and all that night.*" (1 Sam. xix. 24.) In the same sense also, when *Lucius Quintus Cincinnatus* is sent for by the Romans to be made dictator, he is described by *Aurelius Victor* as having been found "*naked* plowing on the other side of the Tiber."*

* See the Essay for a new translation of the Bible, and Calmet's Fragments. It is curious to observe how correctly modern writers can explain,

Now, besides the *ephod* or priestly vestment with which both the histories of Samuel and Chronicles describe David as dressed upon this occasion, the latter adds—that he was also "*clothed with a robe of fine linen.*" This, we apprehend, was the outward robe, or garment, of royalty; when, therefore, Michal accuses David with *uncovering himself*, he had, there can be little doubt, cast off this robe for the convenience of joining in the music and the dance, like Jesus, who "*laid aside his garments*" for the convenience of washing his disciples' feet; and as dress in the east was tenaciously regarded as a mark of distinction, a captious objector might, with some plausibility, represent the act of laying aside the royal robe in the view of the people as one unworthy of the king of Israel, and as confounding him in dress and appearance with the commonality.

Those, however, who will acquit David, on this occasion, of all immorality of conduct, may still think, perhaps, with Mr. Burke, that *majesty*, when stripped of its *externals*, becomes only *a jest;* especially if majesty should be found *dancing* with the common people upon the democratic floor. The disciples, too, of John Wesley—who was wont to say that *every step a person danced, he danced a step nearer to the devil*—may naturally be supposed to feel some scruples at the conduct of the king of Israel in the present instance. This leads us to offer some remarks on the subject of DANCING. The primitive dance, it should be borne in remembrance, was, in its earliest origin and simplest form, but the art of expressing the sentiments and feelings of the mind by the movements of the body. It is described by a French writer to be "*the language of gesture,*

---

and how elegantly they can elucidate, those allusions in classical history; which, when occurring in the scriptures, are not unfrequently rendered the subject of misplaced wit, and unbecoming levity. This incident in the life of the virtuous *Cincinnatus*, and the statement of his being found "*naked* plowing on the other side of the Tiber," is thus expressed in "The History of Rome:"—"The venerable senator had already been invested with the dignity of consul, and by his firmness and moderation had for a moment suspended the jealous animosities of the patricians and the plebeans; but his domestic happiness had been wounded by the banishment of his son Cœso, who had embraced, with imprudent ardour, the cause of the nobles, and his fortune had been exhausted in scrupulously discharging the security which he had engaged in for his appearance. The *assiduous* cultivation of six remaining acres, afforded to the disconsolate father a scanty subsistence; and his *aged limbs* were employed in the labour of agriculture, when his daily task was interrupted by the deputies of the senate, who hailed him with the title of dictator."—Vol. I. p. 176.

"*the first and simplest of all languages.*"* Hence, at a very early period of society, dancing became a part of the religious ceremonies of the primitive nations of the earth, and a natural mode of manifesting gratitude to the gods. Among the nations of Greece dancing was common, not only at the festival solemnities, but even at the funeral processions. The latter were naturally and, indeed, rationally regarded as occasions of public rejoicing by the survivors; who, like modern believers in the soul's immortality, considered that their friends had gone into *immediate* felicity, and the company of the gods. Hence the funerals of the heroes of Greece were celebrated with *pæans*, or songs of triumph and dances.† That the practice of dancing was not considered any derogation from earthly greatness among the early nations of Greece, may be inferred from the fact of their believing that dancing was in use even among the gods. Homer represents Apollo as playing upon his harp and dancing. Hence, says Bishop Potter, "*Athenæus* concludes "that, in those ages, they accounted dancing a thing be-"coming *persons of honour and wisdom.*" And although the more inflexible character and sterner virtues of the Romans led them to estimate meanly this and similar accomplishments, yet among the Greeks it was far otherwise; and *Epaminondas*, who is reported by *Cornelius Nepos* to have excelled in "the art of dancing, of playing upon "the harp and flute, with other liberal sciences," is admitted even by Cicero to have been "the chief of all the "Greeks." A striking illustration of the religious dances of the heathens is to be found in the instance of the worshippers of the golden calf dancing before the object of their idolatry; the dance forming, upon this occasion, in common with the burnt offerings and peace offerings, the religious solemnity of the day. Some passages in the Psalms indicate the adoption of the practice of dancing by,

* *The Abbé Raynal.* This writer, in describing the war dances of the Iroquois Indians, observes—"There is something so regular, rapid and terrible in these dances, that an European, when first he sees them, cannot help shuddering. He imagines that the ground will in a moment be covered with blood, and scattered limbs; and that none of the dancers or spectators will survive. It is somewhat remarkable that, in the first ages of the world, and among savage nations, dancing should be an *imitative art;* and that it should have lost that characteristic in civilized countries, where it seems to be reduced to a set of uniform steps without meaning."—*History of the East and West Indies*, vol. v. p. 124.

† Potter's Antiquities of Greece.

or its existence among, the people of God, as an appropriate medium, expressive of devotional sentiment and religious joy.

"Praise ye the Lord.
Let them praise his name in the *dance*.
Let them sing praises unto him with the timbrel and harp." (149 Psalm.)

"Praise ye the Lord.
Praise him with the sound of the trumpet.
Praise him with the psaltery and harp.
Praise him with the timbrel and the *dance*.
Praise him with stringed instruments and organs. (150 Psalm.)

At the feast of tabernacles, also, although one of the most solemn festivals of the Jews, religious sentiment and joy would seem to have been expressed by singing and dancing, the people carrying branches of the myrtle or palm tree around the altar of burnt offerings, and joining in certain appropriate songs; and that to these dancing was added, we collect from a passage in Deutronomy, which, when correctly translated, is exactly to our point. "*Thou shalt observe the feast of tabernacles seven days after that thou has gathered in thy corn and thy wine: and thou shalt rejoice in thy* DANCE,* *thou and thy son, and thy daughter, and thy man servant, and thy maid servant, the levite, the stranger, and the fatherless, and the widow that are within thy gates.*"† (Deut. xvi. 13—14.)

Upon the occasion, then, which it has been the object of this Article to examine and explain, we behold Israel's newly-appointed king giving praise to that God who had raised him from a shepherd's life, to the highest pitch of earthly greatness. Free from the intoxication too generally attendant on power newly acquired—careless of the dignity of office, and the distinctions of rank, when God's glory alone should occupy the mind—the prince unites with the peasant in the sincerity of their common devotion, and the

* Improperly rendered *feast* in the English Bible.

† The classical reader may call to mind that Plutarch has suggested that the *Hebrews* kept this feast in honour of *Bacchus*. The learning of Plutarch in the heathen mysteries is undoubted, these having been a favourite branch of his studies; he must not, however, be accepted as an authority upon Jewish antiquities. May not the coincidence in the time, occasion, and manner of celebrating this festival, and that in honour of Bacchus, have suggested the comparison to the mind of the heathen historian; the Jewish and the heathen festival both falling after the vintage, and both being celebrated, as it should seem, by processions, with green branches, singing, and dancing.

fulness of their common joy. Of simple habits, he casts aside the trappings of royalty, and joins with his people to praise their Maker in the dance. Of accomplished manners, excelling in the sister arts of music and poetry, he tunes to higher themes that harp whose inspiring tones had dissipated the melancholy of Saul; he raises the devotion of the assembled worshippers by that immortal song which inspires us even at these distant times, and by which the flame of religious exaltation is still kindled on the altar of the holy mind! Happily for our purpose the Hebrew chroniclers have preserved that divine composition which, upon this memorable occasion, was given by David to Asaph, the chief of the musicians, and his company. With some extracts from this song we shall conclude our remarks; and when the reader has considered them, let him say, whether the dictation of such sentiments can be supposed compatible with co-existing impurity of thought, and public indecency of action:—

"Give thanks unto the Lord, call upon his name, make known his deeds among the people.

Sing unto him, sing psalms unto him, talk ye of all his wondrous works.

Glory ye in his holy name: let the heart of them rejoice that seek the Lord.

Sing unto the Lord all the earth; shew forth from day to day his salvation.

Declare his glory among the heathen, his marvellous works among all nations.

For great is the Lord and greatly to be praised: he is also to be feared above all gods.

For all the gods of the people are idols: but the Lord made the heavens.

Glory and honour are in his presence; strength and gladness are in his place.

Give unto the Lord ye kindreds of the people, give unto the Lord glory and strength.

Give unto the Lord the glory due unto his name, bring an offering, and come before him: worship the Lord in the beauty of holiness.

Fear before him all the earth: the world also shall be stable that it be not moved.

Let the heavens be glad, and let the earth rejoice, and let men say among the nations—the Lord reigneth.

Let the sea roar and the fulness thereof; let the fields rejoice and all that is therein.

Then shall the trees of the wood sing out at the presence of the Lord, because he cometh to judge the earth.

O give thanks unto the Lord for he is good, for his mercy endureth for ever!" (1 Chron. chap. xvi.)

If opportunity should occur, we may perhaps apply ourselves to the explanation of some other difficulties which exist in the history, and the refutation of some other ob-

jections which have been urged against the character of, David; being well convinced that, upon a critical and unprejudiced examination of the life of David, he will appear well to have justified the description of being "*a man* "*after God's own heart:*" that is, as the original imports, after God's own *choice*—a man chosen of God, on account of his suitability of character, to be king of Israel.

THE YEAR.

(*Continued from Vol.* ii. *p.* 162.)

Of him no more. The Apostate's fate stands forth
A beacon to direct and warn mankind;
To shew the devious path—the downward course—
The loss of virtue—and the wreck of faith.
Few since th' arch traitor, Judas, so have fall'n;
And none can claim a picture thus deformed,
(The offspring rather of the muse's dream)
But those whose recreant hearts, ingrate and false,
Beat conscious—*that its features are their own.*
To other thoughts and purer themes I turn—
To meditate on life, and death, and man.
How wide and various are the paths of life,
But tending each to one appointed goal,
"*Where all the travellers meet.*" So sang the bard—
His theme The Grave—where now himself he lies.
Thus we all muse—and moralize—and die!
The waves of time sweep o'er these mortal shores;
And man is the small sand that, grain by grain,
Is swallowed by the deep. Death comes to all;
Yet few regard his coming, or prepare
For his ungracious presence, until near,
And then behold with terror and despair.
Unwelcome visitor to worldly men,
He comes between them and their hopes—their all;
He wakes them from their dreaming; cuts them off
From the false promise of their futile joys.
Death to the *best* has sorrows. Who can rise
From the full table of luxuriant life,

Leaving the fellowship of kindred—friends—
Affection's cup untasted—and depart
From the rich feast this fertile earth affords
Without a bitter struggle? Wisely given,
Affliction leads us down the sharp descent,
And, step by step, prepares us for the grave.
Still doubts or terrors haunt. The sceptic sinks
In hopeless apathy. The bigot starts—
Eternal torment blazing in his view.
One finds annihilation—one despair!
The Christian only—he who learns the truth
From scripture and from reason—looks on death
As on his father's will, and bows his head
Resigned—submissive. He who lives to fill,
Active, the duties of this busy world
May die—(though keen the struggle)—peaceful die;
Finding no terrors in death's pilgrimage—
May pass the gulph and say—"It leads to life!"
May look on those he leaves and feel the pang,
The bitter pang, of parting, and yet smile,
Assured that life, or death, or weal, or woe,
Equal proceed from him who governs all;
Who rules at once the sky—the earth—the grave;
Whose promise gives eternal life to man,
And bids him hope where most he might despair.

'Tis healthful to the heart, amid the cares,
The din and bustle of the world to pause
For meditation. From the crowd awhile
To step aside and look on Nature; hold
Some converse with that parent in whose arms,
Our earliest, happiest hours were cheerful passed:
Frequent amid the city's haunts forgot.
——'Twas evening—and the peaceful waters slept
Upon the valley's bosom; the high hills,
On either side, their awful forms upreared,
Like hostile hosts gigantic; the bright sun
Sank on the horizon in the midst—then seemed
To pause e'er he descended; burnished gold
Was his bright chariot, and the purple clouds,
Festooned with rays of fiery glory, formed
A rich pavilion round. His parting beams

On earth, and water, hill, and vale, and sky,
Shed tints of beauty, varied, rich, sublime.
The rippling lake, with arrowy brightness strewed;
The distant valley, clustered o'er with trees,
Whence frequent seen the cottage roof peeps forth;
The swelling mead, peopled with moving flocks,
Minute in distance, like a mimic scene
Of fairy fancy, where the sun-beams played
'Mid every shade of verdure; the brown rocks
Warmed with a glow, like Afric's tawny sons,
And tinged with Autumn's mantle; the rich sky,
Where other hills, high above these, reposed,
Cloud formed, and tipp'd with fire, like fabled scenes
Of rapt Elisium; these the parting sun
Illumined or created, till his rays,
Faint and more faint, the varied scene displayed—
Each fading beauty vanished from the earth—
Each lingering glory gradual left the skies—
And sober night in solemn stillness reigned.
'Mid such a scene I wandered forth, and felt
Its influence on my heart, and feel it still
Though years have rolled, and that same sun hath set
Over the graves of thousands, who then breathed,
And trod the earth in sorrow or in joy.
Night reigned! but other shores saw morning rise
Gilding new scenes with joy. The Atlantic wave
Foamed in the noon-tide sun; the hum of men
Was in the cities of the new-found world;
The hunter in his forest. Morning's dawn
Rose on the islands of the peaceful sea,
And saw the swift canoe steered on its way
In savage stateliness. Rich India sprang,
Like her own tiger, from the den of night
To bask in the hot sun beams. The wide earth,
At that *one* moment, *all* the hours contained—
Beautious variety!—and every clime,
And every season—and they all were blessed.
And sun and shade, and morning, noon, and night—
Spring with her buds and summer with her bloom—
The fruits of autumn, e'en stern winter's snows
Were governed by one sun as his strong rays

Descending, or withheld, informed the scene.
Thus good, and seeming evil, life and death,
The hours and seasons of the days of man;
Our budding, bloom, maturity, decay—
All that delights or chills, impels or charms,
Our wanderings, and our virtues, and our doom,
Are governed by one God—who rules the whole;
Who moulds us to his purpose—for his praise;
To whom we are—as all his creatures are—
The offspring of his bounty and his power.
All nature and all art—matter and mind—
Earth, air, and ocean—insect, bird, beast, man—
But modes of varied being, multiform—
And, where life is, of varied blessing too—
Each working to its end and all for good;
And man the chief, on earth the head of all—
His fortunes several, but his end the same.
For honour some and some dishonour. These
To soar aloft, and those to sink or fall;
(But for a season.) Some to hold their course
Right onward; devious some to stray, or plunge
In vice or folly—wild as ocean's wave!
Eccentric as the rapid comet's course!
But the wild waves obey HIS voice and stay
At their appointed limits; the swift orb
Cast into utter space, wheels round and rolls
Obedient to the finger that directs—
Fulfilled its hidden purpose! So man fills
His Maker's pleasure; and (revealed to man)
Futurity the mystery explains.
Man—and this life but part of one great whole,
Too complex and too high for human thought;
Vast as all space; majestic as the skies;
Pure as the breath of nature; and sublime
As that ETERNAL MIND, whose plastic will
Created first—upholds and governs all.

(To be continued.)

ERRATUM.—Page 160, (in the last Number) line 13, for *indignant* read *malignant*.

THE FREETHINKING CHRISTIANS' REVIEW OF THE RELIGIOUS WORLD.

MRS. FRY.

"Charity vauuteth not itself—is not puffed up—doth not behave itself unseemly—seeketh not her own."—PAUL.

ANY particular notice of Mrs. Fry and her follies, would be very unworthy the objects proposed by the conductors of this Work, if Mrs. Fry were to be regarded only as an isolated and eccentric individual; or, as Quaker Sewell would say, if hers were to be considered "a particular case" of "*odd behaviour*, which she herself must be responsible "for." But viewing, as we do, this lady as occupying a most important station among *the saints* in general, and *the Quakers* in particular—considering her as one with whom the cause of her party is closely identified—beholding in her the finished representative of *Quakerism*—as, in fact, a concretion of all the characteristic qualities of the sect—we apprehend that an examination of the public conduct of this lady becomes a matter of just importance; and we feel authorized in adducing her example as illustrative of our objections to the principles—not only of her sect—but to the practices of the whole tribe of pharisaic professors of all sects; who, under the cloak of charity and religion, are but vaunting their own virtues, and promoting their own ends.

It is not a little remarkable that, notwithstanding the strictures we originally offered upon the conduct of Mrs. Fry and her party; and notwithstanding the laboured exposure we have since given of the dangerous tendency of the principles of Quakerism, not a single individual of the body has ventured to impugn our statements, or to vindicate the conduct, either of the lady in question, or the principles of the body. This caution, on the part of the Quakers, is the more singular when we call to mind the readiness with which their early writers undertook to answer the charges which appeared in print against their avowed principles. Indeed, so late as 1802, there issued officially from the Friends, a reprint of the "Extracts from the Minutes and Advices of the Yearly "Meeting of Friends, held in London," from which, under the head "BOOKS," we extract the following *advice*:—

"*Friends are desired to be diligent in spreading Friends'* "*books which are answers to adversaries, and to get them ex-* "*posed to sale where the adversaries' books are sold; and this to* "*be done in due time, and not delayed till the service may* "*be partly over.*"

This is all, no doubt, prudent, excellent advice; but why have not the Friends acted in the spirit of this advice in our instance? Why do they delay publishing an answer to our arguments "till the service may be partly over?" Whence this forbearance? Wherefore this prudent, this studied silence? We invite them to the contest, and we will so far aid the object of the above-quoted minute, that we promise that any direct answer to our Review of Quakerism shall be *exposed to sale where our own Work is sold.*

There has, indeed, advanced to the contest an individual as the champion of Mrs. Fry, whose arguments, supposing them to proceed from a party closely identified with the Quakers, we readily consented to insert in our Register; but judge of our surprise and disappointment when, by a subsequent communication from the same correspondent, he informed us that he was "*not a Quaker, nor in any manner* "*connected with Mrs. Fry.*" Our disappointment, indeed, was the more complete when, by his own confession, the writer dwindled down to a mere nondescript character, pertaining to no sect or party; and when, actuated probably by a love of adventure, or a desire for victory, he presented himself before us as that flighty, chivalrous sort of personage with whom we could feel little of interest, and less of duty, to contend. But that we may not misrepresent the character of our correspondent, let him be permitted to introduce himself. After denying that he is a Quaker the gentleman proceeds:—

"*In your reply, therefore, I beg you will consider me as an* "*individual of* NO SECT OR PARTY; *a sort of* DON QUIXOTE, "*even without a squire, regardless* WITH WHAT, OR WITH "WHOM I CONTEND; *and anxious to receive in my own per-* "*son, without* INVOLVING OTHERS *in my adventures and* "*disgrace, any blows which may be expected in an encounter* "*with literary giants like yourselves.*"

Such, then, is our opponent; but the parties most concerned, it will be observed, keep their peace: their spirit is not moved in the cause of their sainted sister—the Quakers hold *a silent meeting* upon the subject of our *testimony* against them. Having, however, in the first instance, bound ourselves to publish the arguments of our correspondent, J. F.,

the same will be found in our last number, to which the reader will please refer, that he may the better understand the force, if force it shall be thought to possess, of our rejoinder. And first, a word as to the propriety of remarking *at all* on the conduct and character of Mrs. Fry.

Mrs. Fry is a public character—a public character in the strictest sense of the designation—as much so as Wilberforce, as Cobbett, or Carlisle. *We* have not brought her before the public; it was her own act, or the act of her party, which raised her to the pedastal of public fame on which, in common with other gazers, we beheld her. We found her ostensibly and publicly engaged in the difficult, the immense, the gigantic effort of reforming the prison discipline of this country. We heard of her, through the accustomed channels of public report, in her various peregrinations from prison to prison, throughout England and Scotland. We witnessed her taking into her own hands the duties of the state secretary for the home department; and, in our own metropolis, performing the functions vested by the laws in the city magistracy. In this important, public, and self-assumed station, Mrs. Fry, we apprehend, became a legitimate and fair object, either of censure or of praise, according as her motives should, upon inquiry, appear either personal or pure—her plans visionary or practicable. There was something, we confess, that little comported with our conceptions of the female character, or the female duties, in the position occupied by this lady and her pious sisterhood; and we ventured to present our ideas of that character, and of those duties, in terms which, we believe, are expressive of the common sentiments of all men, and which were fortified by the recommendations of scripture; and certainly more from a feeling of *pity*, than intended disrespect, towards Mr. Fry, the husband of the lady of the same name, we dropped an observation which was designed to express no more than our opinion that, by an inversion of the order of Nature, the public labours and public honours of the lady occupied so large a space in the public mind, as to put a complete extinguisher upon the gentleman, and to render the family name known only in connection with his wife. If in this our sentiment, however, we have been in any way mistaken, it will give us pleasure. Indeed, since the period of the publication of the remarks in question, we have seen one or two little endeavours of the gentleman himself in the public prints, which go certainly to prove the existence of Mr. Fry, and which may possibly have

been designed to assert his fair claims to public notice; at any rate, in one of these essays, as the reader will remember, the clear object of the gentleman was to deprive his wife of the appropriate honour which public report had assigned to her of having attempted the conversion of *Spring* and *Langhan*, the *prize fighters;* and of having, by the joint influence of her spirit and her purse, succeeded in frustrating a *pitched battle* between them—a line of proceeding this so much in Mrs. Fry's own peculiar way, that we confess we were among the thousands who took it to be true.*

The sex of Mrs. Fry has been adverted to, and it is sometimes pleaded, in abatement of our censures; whilst it is, in fact, that very circumstance which renders her public conduct in an increased degree unseemly and improper. *We* cannot help her sex. *We* would, if possible, keep her at home. *We* would willingly see her cultivating the softer virtues; excelling in the domestic duties —training up her children in the paths of religion and rectitude; to her daughters, the exemplar of every femenine accomplishment; to her sons, the teacher of whatever can grace the manly virtues—seeking, as more estimable than the praise of all the world beside, the approval of her own husband; and inciting and inspiring him by her energies to the pursuit of every honourable, useful, and noble endeavour, which has the happiness of mankind for its object, and the approbation of heaven for its reward! Such, we say again and again, is the duty, as it is also the true glory, of the woman, the wife, and mother; home is the orbit of her motion—the centre of her influence and attraction! A religious woman, indeed, we confess, has—if like Mrs. Fry she possess health, affluence, opportunity, and talents—duties to perform beyond the immediate circle of her family; but what opportunities are not presented for the exercise of these in her own religious connection, to whom, by religious obligations, her first care is due! For "*as we have opportunity,*" indeed, we are exhorted to "*do* "*good unto all,*" but "*ESPECIALLY unto them who are of the* "*household of faith.*" In instruction, therefore, to the ignorant of her own church; (*and much do they need instruction*) in assistance to the poor; in attentions to the

* It appears, upon the authority of the Editor of the Worcester Journal, that the lady who took the pious pains above alluded to, was not *our* MRS. FRY, but a lady of the same school and name; hence the original MRS. FRY became confounded with her more humble imitator.

sick, in advice and counsel to the younger females entering on the duties of domestic life, it may reasonably be presumed that the time which a mother could spare from the concerns of a numerous family, might be well employed; but these, alas! would never reach the ear of the public—would never command the applause of the world, and therefore they are generally found insufficient for the grasp of religious pride and spiritual ambition.

But our correspondent comes forward to attest that, notwithstanding the public labours of these pious ladies, their domestic duties *are* performed in an exemplary manner. "*You* (says J. F.) cannot conceive how the female "duties are performed, while the attention is distracted by "'complicated schemes of public reformation.' I will in-"form you, though you cannot conceive it, that, from *my* "*own personal knowledge*, those duties are performed, and "perhaps more effectually, than is generally the case, even "in instances where there is nothing but such duties to "engage the attention, by the more than common activity "and industry exemplified by these females." Now, if we also had not spoken, in this instance, of our *own personal knowledge*, we should object to take that upon the word of an anonymous correspondent, which we would not receive upon his oath, carrying with it the additional weight of his name, however respectable that may be. We are called upon to receive that upon the authority of two little letters, *J* and *F.*, which we would not believe if sworn to by Aristides and Cato; for what J. F. knows of his *own personal knowledge* is, in fact, a *moral impossibility*. We are not so ignorant of the important and unceasing duties which devolve on a mother, and a wife, as not to know that her time *cannot* be divided between her family and the public, without neglect of the one or the other. We say the mother of *nine children* cannot, without neglect of those children, devote even the *time* which is necessary to mature and carry into execution Mrs. Fry's public plans. But all who have had to do with public business must know that, important as is the sacrifice of *time*, that is really the least part of the evil; it is the occupation of the mind, the interests and the feelings in such pursuits, which really unfit and indispose one to employ the little leisure which remains at home, in the prosecution of the home duties. A lady of affluence, may, indeed, deputize her maternal duties to servants; but can she deputize also to servants the interests, the feelings, and the responsibilities

of a mother? The "*Sisters of Charity,*" in catholic countries, referred to by Sir James Mackintosh, in his elegant panegyric pronounced on Mrs. Fry in the House of Commons, were, as we took occasion to remark, *unmarried females;* they were devoted to the single life; they had, as the orator truly remarked, "*previously relinquished all the* "*duties of social life.*" Hence, then, *they* could well spend their days in attending the sick, visiting hospitals, and performing other charitable offices, no other occupations or duties devolving upon them. But our "*Protestant Sisters of* "*Charity,*" besides undertaking these offices, incur all the responsibilities of domestic life; and, taking Mrs. Fry as an instance, her public labours are not confined to the reform of prison discipline; but she is actively engaged in various other objects of a public nature, and is wherewithall a *minister* and *apostle* of her sect, going about from place to place, for months in the year, engaged in the religious concerns of the Society of Friends. In our original strictures on the public conduct of these ladies, we had described their time as "occupied with complicated *plans* of public "reformation; their attention withdrawn from their families, "and devoted to the improvement of the discipline, or the "reform of the morals, of a prison; and *their days spent in* "*the successive engagements of public religious meetings.*" Our correspondent saw plainly enough that, if this description were true, it necessarily involved the conclusion—that the domestic duties of these ladies must be neglected; he therefore, from the very necessity of the case, sets about to impeach the correctness of our statement. And how does he attempt this? Not by denying that these ladies *are* engaged in various plans of public reformation; not by denying that their time *is* spent in successive religious meetings; but by applying himself to *one* of their public labours—the subject of *prison discipline;* and by denying that this particular scheme of public reformation is complicated; "there "is nothing (says he) in all this to distract the brain, or to "lead the mind out of the track of the common pursuits "and concerns of life." Now, to pass over the unfairness of arguing upon *one* plan only of public reformation, when *several* such plans were alluded to, we say that the prison reform plan was, of itself, and alone, a complicated, an arduous, and difficult task. Let our correspondent read only the origin and history of this plan; let him attend to the *official report* of the labours of the female committee, as presented to the public by Mr. Buxton, the

relative of Mrs. Fry, in his work on Prison Discipline, in 1818, and he will be convinced that we have rightly described the plan in question. And when our correspondent has thus refreshed his memory, will he venture to deny that the formation and the giving effect to this plan, occupied a very large portion of the time of those concerned therein? Upon this point let us consult the report itself; let us put down and confute the anonymous defender of these ladies upon the evidence of their authorized advocate, Mr. Buxton. After the school for the instruction of the children of the prisoners was first commenced by the ladies' committee, in Newgate—"*These ladies,* "(says Mr. Buxton) *with some others, continued labour-* "*ing together for some time, and the school became* THEIR "*REGULAR and DAILY OCCUPATION.*" This regular and daily occupation, be it observed, related only to the school; when, however, it was attempted to instruct and reform the adult female prisoners, it was necessary to establish a regular committee of ladies. "*This committee* (says the report, p. 124) *immediately presented itself: it consisted of the wife of a* "*clergyman, and eleven members of the Society of Friends.* "*They professed their willingness* TO SUSPEND EVERY OTHER "*ENGAGEMENT AND AVOCATION, and* TO DEVOTE THEM-"*SELVES TO NEWGATE; and in truth they have performed* "*their promise. With no interval of relaxation, and with but* "*few intermissions from the call of other and more imperious* "*duties,* THEY HAVE LIVED AMONG THE PRISONERS." Will our correspondent have the kindness to inform us *how* the domestic duties of these ladies were performed at this time; when, in behalf of those interesting objects—the heroines of the Newgate Calendar—they had suspended "*every other engagement and avocation,* and literally "*lived* "*among the prisoners?*" Will the writer say, that "*there is* "*nothing in all this to distract the brain, or to lead the mind* "*out of the track of the common pursuits and concerns of life?*" Or will he venture to impeach the testimony thus unintentionally given by Mr. Buxton in support of our representation of the case? Our correspondent adds, indeed, that, to these ladies, "*the tendency of enforcing habits of order and cleanliness* "*in others, will be to fix more deeply those habits in themselves;*" this, by the way, is rather an ungracious compliment to the ladies in question. *We* have been rather disposed, we confess, to admire the habits of order and cleanliness of the Quaker ladies; if, however, need be that such habits be more firmly fixed in them, it may reasonably be presumed that some

other school than Newgate might be selected for the purpose.

J. F. will, perhaps, say that, when the Newgate reform scheme was completed, and after it had been brought into complete play, these ladies would naturally relax from their toils, and find more leisure for the duties of their families and their homes. It is very true that, in most of these cases of pretended benevolence, when the novelty of the thing has worn off, and when public interest and observation are on the vane, the immediate and active agents are found to slacken their personal services, and to leave to some stipendary drudge the execution of their plans, the former continuing to *bear* all the praise, and the latter all the labour of the undertaking. But it is not true that such parties return to the performance of the quiet, unobtrusive, every-day duties of life. On the contrary, new schemes of pious folly are formed; other resources to attract attention are attempted; and fresh demands on public observation are obtruded.

Our correspondent, it will be seen, affects to be very indignant at our affixing on these ladies, the imputation that "*all their works they do to be seen of men;*" he expected, he professes, that, in support of such a charge, "some *overt act* on the part of Elizabeth Fry, some "unequivocal demand of popular attention and applause," would have been adduced. Does the gentleman then expect that, in order to sustain a charge of seeking for worldly applause, we should find the hypocrites of the present day like their predecessors of old, when they did their alms, SOUNDING A TRUMPET "*in the synagogues and in the "streets, that they might have glory of men?*" No! these have become more skilful in their craft; these have improved upon the example of those who have gone before them; these affect a disregard to the praises of the world: under the cloak of humility these disguise their real object, and clothe themselves with what has been aptly denominated by the celebrated Porson—"*the devil's darling vice,*"

"*The pride that apes humility.*"

But it must not be supposed that even the primitive hypocrites would have sounded their own trumpets if, like the modern ones, they could have relied on others to perform this office. These latter, indeed, have their regular trumpeters, parties on whom they can always reckon—both in parliament, and by means of the press—to sound their praises;

and they know also that there is a large portion of the public, comprehending all the unthinking, the vain, the proud, the hypocritical, and corrupt, who delight at once to hear and to give such praises; and who, when the specious and plausible virtues are wafted down the stream of popularity by the zephyrs of public applause, not only "*enjoy the triumph,*" but frequently "*partake the gale.*"

J. F. expresses his surprise that the strong evidence relative to Mrs. Fry "dwindled, and was diluted into the "pusillanimous sneer of '*it does so happen* that her bene-"'volent efforts are noised abroad in the world;'" as though by that expression it was intended to admit that that result, as far as Mrs. Fry was concerned, was purely accidental. So far from this, the whole of the praises of this lady are, as we are well convinced, worked and managed by a party—a numerous, powerful, and increasing party, who, under the pretence of religion and charity, are administering to their own personal ends, and in whose hands she is but too suitable an instrument. But nothing will satisfy J. F. short of proving that, by some "*overt act,*" this lady had "*obtruded* her endeavours on the "public gaze;" that "she had *sought* to be complimented in the senate." Really this is putting too much upon us; as though a party actuated by the motives we have assumed —and that party *a Quakeress,* would be so careless about furnishing evidence against herself; so free from all disguise as to allow herself to be caught in the very act of soliciting public applause. We freely confess that that view of the motives which we offered to the public, touching Mrs. Fry and her holy sisterhood, was derived from no one specific act, but from the general character and complexion; the spirit and tendency of their whole public proceedings, as contrasted with their profession, their sex, the principles of Christianity, and the precepts of Jesus. And we must contend that, when a woman—professedly a religious woman, publicly acts a part which is inconsistent with her sex and assumed character—when she undertakes services to which she is not called by the precepts of scripture, or by the history and example of the holy women of old, which is calculated to wean her from her natural obligations, and from that care of her offspring which we regard as a sacred trust—which can be attended by no practical result—as the reformation of a handful of criminals, whether real or pretended, during their sojourn within the walls of Newgate, is not to be placed against the pernicious consequences

which would result to the state from the irregular zeal of individuals relieving the lawfully constituted authorities of the land from those responsibilities and duties which devolve upon them, and by virtue of which they are bound to secure to the prisoners a course of treatment consistent with humanity, and in accordance with the laws—when such a part, we say, surrounded by so many objections, attended with so much certain evil, and promising so little good—when such a part is acted by such a character, we have a right to question the motive; and it is really charitable to suppose that *vanity* alone can account for such conduct.*

---

* Whether *vanity* is, in this instance, free from all admixture of *self-interest* we do not undertake to say. The husband of the lady is a banker and tea dealer. May not the popularity of the lady in the religious world operate as an advertisement to the house, extending the accounts of the banking concern with the godly, and increasing among the pious ladies of the community the demand for the *hyson* of St. Mildred's Court? The "Equitable Loan Company," got up by this very party, is an instructive illustration of the dependance to be placed on professions of public benevolence and philanthropy. This company has been well described in parliament as "*christian* in profession, and *jewish* in principle;" and we agree with the old Chancellor—that the term *equitable* is a misnomer. And yet notwithstanding the evident hypocrisy, and detected selfishness of this company, its projectors have the effontery to declare in their advertisements, that "a desire to diminish crime, compassion for the poor, indignation at the frauds and imposition to which the necessitous submit, with the expectation of a fair, though very moderate, remuneration for the investment of capital, and dedication of their time, have originated the design." Now trade is essentially a selfish pursuit, we suspect, therefore, all pretences by which benevolence is sought to be mixed up with money getting. The *moderate remuneration* to which these philanthropists propose to restrict themselves for the advance of capital is 10 per cent.; besides which, those saintly parties who concocted this scheme of charity are understood to have divided the shares among themselves and friends, before it was made known to the public, and then to have sold a large portion of them at £5. and £8. per share premium. Individuals might, we believe, be named who have thus put thousands into their pockets. In this way the saints make a gain of their godliness, whilst the public will sustain a loss from their credulity. Had charity any part or lot in this scheme, all profits made upon the transfer of shares would have gone to the capital stock of the company, so as to have reduced the interest at which money should be advanced to the poor. By a letter signed "Joseph Fry, Mildred's Court," and published in the daily newspapers, we are informed Mrs. Fry was not the inventor of this plausible scheme:—why Mrs. Fry cannot be expected to do every thing for the public;—Mr. Fry, therefore, it is understood, has put his hand to this pious work; he is also treasurer, and one of the directors, of the company; and as Elizabeth and Joseph are one in the Lord, they may rejoice together at the good they have done—to say nothing of the gain they have made. We may, however, be permitted to doubt whether, if this thing had not fallen into bad odour with the public, Friend Joseph would have bestirred himself to contradict the rumour which ascribed the honour of its production to Mrs. Fry.

It is confessedly, indeed, a difficult task to penetrate the human character; and—in the opinion of one not less skilled in a knowledge of human nature than in the power and charms of verse—to the appreciation of individual character, it is not sufficient to consult action alone — or rather single actions; for

> "Not always actions show the man: we find
> Who does a kindness, is not therefore kind."

The advice, therefore, the conclusion of the poet, with regard to the study of character, is—

> "Search then the *ruling passion*: there alone
> *The wild* are constant, and *the cunning* known;
> *The fool* consistent, and *the false* sincere;
> Priests, princes, *women*, no dissemblers here."—POPE.

In accordance, then, with this evidently wise direction, we *have* searched the *ruling passion*, and, though other motives may possibly have a subordinate influence upon the conduct of the lady in question, yet a passion for this world's applause, we have concluded, and do conclude, to be the master passion of her breast, because it explains and reconciles, and is sufficient to account for all her actions. But, as our correspondent J. F. appears to be so unpractised in the ways of the world—as he manifests so interesting an ignorance of the latent motives which may possibly influence these pious endeavours; as nothing short of "*overt* "*acts*," and "unequivocal proofs," will shake his faith in the purity and singleness of the motives which may prompt these specious labours, we have, though not in fairness bound so to do, collected some little evidence of the kind required, which, we trust, may operate to the enlightenment, not only of J. F., but to all who possess the like simplicity.*

To proceed then with our evidence. "Sister Elizabeth Fry," it appears, had no sooner brought into operation her pious plans of reform in Newgate, than "Brother Buxton's" book on Prison Discipline made its appearance. In this work there was a department of the book entitled "*Proceedings* "*of the Ladies' Committee at Newgate;*" under this head

* Although our correspondent asserts that he is not in any way connected with Mrs. Fry, yet has it been whispered to us that he has A SISTER, who is a fellow labourer with the chief apostle in Newgate, and his virtuous indignation against us has been supposed to have been aroused by this circumstance; we do not say that he has been in any way influenced by such a consideration; we will rather take it that his defence of Mrs. Fry has proceeded from *simplicity—mere simplicity!*

the writer details, with suitable praises, the whole of the labours of Mrs. Fry, his *sister-in-law*—her wisdom, her patience, her perseverance, her liberality, her wonder-working powers with the prostitutes of Newgate; her visits to the sheriffs of London; her influence with the governor and ordinary of Newgate; the difficulties she had conquered, and the obstacles she had removed, are all set forth in a manner calculated to raise the fame of her name, and to exalt the conceptions of her piety. Mr. Buxton is a member of parliament, and a gentleman, both of talent and eloquence, and the effect of a report of Mrs. Fry's labours from his pen will readily be appreciated. It will be said we do not here bring home the act of "obtruding her endeavours on the public gaze," to Mrs. Fry herself—not *legally* so perhaps, at present: Mr. Buxton is *only* her brother-in-law. But there followed in quick time upon Mr. Buxton's pamphlet, a little book by the *brother* of the lady —Friend Joseph John Gurney. Brother Buxton's pamphlet appeared in 1818. Friend Gurney's book was published in 1819; and was entitled—

"*Notes on a Visit made to some of the Prisons in Scotland and the North of England, in company with*

ELIZABETH FRY."

In the preface to this book the writer describes Mr. Buxton's work as "*a late interesting publication;*" and professing that his intention is to strengthen the object of Mr. Buxton's pamphlet, he adds—

"*In the course of my work it has been my particular endeavour to represent and embody the sentiments entertained by my sister, ELIZABETH FRY, whose experience with respect TO PRISONS is much greater than my own.*"

In this work there appeared a second edition, enlarged and corrected, of the labours of Mrs. Fry in Newgate. "The proceedings of *the ladies' association* for visiting that prison (says Mr. Gurney) have already claimed much of public attention. *Very interesting information* has been communicated respecting those proceedings in *Buxton's work* on Prison Discipline; and *vast numbers* of persons have *since* visited Newgate, and become eye witnesses of the good which has been effected in it." (P. 150.) Thus far then the *publicity* given to what our correspondent with so much *naiveté* terms the "*silent and unassuming endeavours of virtuous women,*" is clearly attributed to the information

communicated by Mr. Buxton's book; what, therefore, the brother-in-law of Mrs. Fry had commenced, the brother completes, Mr. Gurney introducing his statement by observing—

"I may now proceed to lay before my readers a narration, which contains the substance of various communications, written and verbal, *RECEIVED FROM SOME ACTIVE MEMBERS OF THE LADIES' ASSOCIATION.*" (P. 151.)

Then follows the narration, containing all the pious, good things Mrs. Fry and her ladies had done, and all the miracles they had wrought in Newgate; and in a note of the author's, appended to this account, there slips out the following unlucky admission:—

"*On reading this statement respecting Newgate to my friends on the committee, who had FURNISHED ME WITH THE PARTICULARS which compose it,* they expressed much uneasiness at my publishing it *as coming from them,* lest they should be deemed too ready to speak of their own proceedings. Being persuaded, however, that no such disposition will be attributed to them, and that the statement will produce the better effect from being *given to the world* on its *TRUE AUTHORITY*, I venture, though not without reluctance, to disregard their fears, and to act upon my own judgment."

What now does our correspondent think of "*the silent and unassuming endeavours* of virtuous women?" Is this no "overt act?" Is this no "unequivocal demand of popular attention and applause?" Does it not prove something more as against Mrs. Fry, than "that the world had *seen* her philanthropic endeavours?" Does it not look rather as though "she *had obtruded* those endeavours on the public gaze?" Is not this—further to adopt the language of J. F.—is not this, "*at least,* something to which an envious ingenuity *might,* without any *very forced* construction, appear to indicate a thirst of praise?" There is something too well worthy of comment in the terms of the above note—the ladies "expressed *much uneasiness,*" it appears, "lest they should be deemed too ready to speak of their own proceedings." These, it may be remarked, are not the fears of real sincerity, which, when called upon by paramount reasons to speak of its own doings, is without calculation—without apprehension as to the opinion of the world, from the consciousness of the purity of its own intent. But these modest and unassuming ladies, it appears, had no objection to *the publishing* their proceedings; they

expressed no uneasiness that Mr. Buxton *had* published their proceedings; they manifested no concern at Mr. Gurney's proposed publication of their labours; their only uneasiness was at the publication of the account "*as coming* "*from them;*" for not only these very words, but even the *italics* are Mr. Gurney's. There is something so calculating, so sly, so truly *quaker like* in this distinction, that it calls to mind the observations which have been reported to us, of some Quaker gentlemen upon the subject of our Review of their principles; who, after expressing their perfect horror at its contents, agreed to think it would be very desirable that the same should be answered—provided the answer were one not implicating their body in the contest—provided, in fact, it were an answer not "*as coming from them.*"

Having now, as we think, brought home the case to the perfect satisfaction, we may hope, of our friend J. F., we cannot avoid noticing some of the lower manœuvres—the lesser arts—by which this party have sought to arrest the attention, and catch the admiration of the thoughtless and the ignorant. Friend Gurney's Notes on Prisons, though a very small, was also a very dear book, and as such inaccessible to the poor; there was, therefore, issued by the party about this time, a little tract, price sixpence, entitled "AN HOUR IN NEWGATE." This little tract is, in every way, to our purpose; for not only did its contents present an artful, and but too successful an endeavour at puffing the Newgate reformers; but there was actually given in the title page, an admirably executed, and truly characteristic wood cut of Mrs. Fry and her sisterhood, exhibiting their "*silent and unassuming* endeavours" in Newgate, before the Sheriff of London, and a numerous company of visiters. We have been so much amused with this little cut, and it so clearly evidences the objects of the parties whom it represents, that we have engaged an eminent artist to take a copy of the same upon a scale suited to our work. Look at the picture, gentle reader—look at the picture! Yes! there is Mrs. Fry, and an admirable likeness it is; there is Mrs. Fry, performing her part before her Newgate auditory; and there are the likenesses of two gentlemen, who were present on the occasion, and who *ought* to have been present on the occasion—the one to record her piety, and the other to enforce her cant. Assuredly those whom it most concerns cannot but own themselves indebted to us, for thus contributing in *their own way*, to extend their celebrity.

This little book then, adorned with this little cut, was got up by Mrs. Fry's party; it was published by a *Quaker* publisher, (E. *Fry*, of portentous name); it was sold by *Quaker* booksellers, one of whom informed us he had sold 1700 copies; it is, as we are assured, on *Quaker* authority, "an authentic report" of what took place on the occasion; its profits, as appears from the title page, are to go to the *Quaker* fund "For the Relief of Female Prisoners;" and the public are therein invited to send "their contributions" towards this pious work to the *Quaker* bankers, "Messrs. Fry and Chapman, Mildred's Court."

Now not to notice the inconsistency of the Friends in engaging the *arts* in their cause, when they deem the arts to be mere *vanities*—we may dwell perhaps with some advantage on the contents of their little book. The "Hour "in Newgate," then professes to be, as it really is, the report of a visit paid by the writer and his family to that prison, to witness "the serious admonitions which report asserted were given, and produced great and good effect on the female prisoners." This report is understood to be from the pen of a gentleman who has perhaps contributed more than any other of his day and generation, to the cant with which this canting age abounds. But as the worthy gentleman appears in this particular instance desirous of sheltering himself from public fame, and of hiding his good deeds under the modest veil of a single initial, it is not our intention to draw him from the retreat he has so unostentatiously taken. It may suffice to remark that Mrs. Fry's Newgate reporter is an active, business-like, sagacious sort of person, well known in the commercial and religious world as the inventor of various schemes of improvement and reform, with which he has, from time to time, favoured the public; and as, notwithstanding his pragmatical habits and love of display, he is really not deficient in intelligence, he forcibly reminds us of the character of Mr. *Faddy*, the retired citizen of "Bracebridge Hall," who is pourtrayed as "*one of those sensible, useful, prosing, troublesome,* "*intolerable old gentlemen, that go about wearying and* "*worrying society with perpetual plans of public utility.*" But not only is the gentleman a very religious, but he is also a very loyal man; and though his loyalty is supposed to have run the highest during the war, when the *shipping interest*, with which he is said to be connected, was in the full tide of success, yet in the cause of religion—the religion of the day—he continues, "*brim full of zeal,*" and in the

race of pious folly he is found to distance most competitors. Indeed as the earth has not proved wide enough for the range of his evangelical career, he has, some time since, commenced operations on the water; not, indeed, like St. Anthony, who preached to the *fishes*, but with the equally hopeful task of converting our *sailors*. Indeed, if we mistake not, the worthy gentleman was the originator of the project—the farcical, hypocritical project—of proselyting our seamen, not excepting indeed those in the king's service. How such men, frequently engaged in the work of human destruction under its most brutal forms, can act upon the precepts of a religion which enjoins the forgiveness of injuries, and love to our enemies—which refers wars and fightings to the lusts that war in our members—and whose great Teacher declared that "*he that taketh up the* "*sword shall perish by the sword*," it is not for us to determine. Nor ought it to be forgotten that the *spiritual concerns* of the navy are already provided for by the state: every king's ship has its chaplain, and we are confident that a chaplain—a drunken chaplain—is more to the sailors taste than a canting saint; and most assuredly will the former produce less mischief to the service than the latter. From a desire, however, to "shoot folly as it flies," we attended at one of the grand gala days, held by the party who profess to take so deep an interest in the sailor's salvation; and certainly the franciscan saint himself, surrounded by his *finny auditory*, all, as ancient legends say, *erect upon their tails*, could not have felt more self-satisfaction than was evinced by the worthy gentleman now described, when leading up to the hustings a string of sailors, dressed up for the occasion, and apparently ignorant of the object for which they were exhibited—as specimens of the society's conversions. And there was Mr. Wilberforce, canting in the chair; and Rowland Hill, grinning his pious approbation; and Sir Claudius Stephen Hunter, overflowing with heavenly joy. Never did we behold the rough, honest faces of our tars to such advantage as when exposed *to such a contrast!**

Now then who could so well record the triumphs of the

* There is a character on the town, a lower practitioner in the same line, *the Reverend* something *Smith*, of Penzance, whom we by no means wish to confound with the chief doctor above alluded to: this Smith follows the sailors' soul-saving line as a regular trade; he has organized a system for besetting the poor fellows as soon as they come on shore, and is known as a common nuisance on board the steam pleasure packets.

Newgate Apostle as the *Marine Missionary;* as one who had given such evidence that he is not to be outdone in folly —even by Mrs. Fry? And truly the worthy visitor and reporter has proved himself eminently gifted for the task he had undertaken, and his peculiar taste and tact are well exhibited in the "*Hour in Newgate.*" This little performance is in the writer's best style; there is something truly dramatic in its general effect and colouring—the secretary's office "*surmounted with bayonets; the lobby dark, "stone-vaulted, and dismal;*" the men on guard with "*stern "aspect: enormous grated and iron-guarded doors, massive "bolts and confined space,*" all prepare the mind for the developement of the piece; and then—*enter Mrs. Fry.* "In a "short time Mrs. Fry entered the room, and having cour-"teously spoken to those whom she knew, and politely noticed "all, a table was placed, and a *bible* laid upon it; and when "she had directed the *first bell* to be rung, she and her friends "took their seats, *having the visitors behind and around them,* "and rows of forms in front (rising like an amphitheatre) "for the prisoners to sit upon."

So then these "*silent and unassuming* labours of virtuous "women," according to their own reporter, appear to have been a public, and almost theatrical exhibition.—There is Mrs. Fry and the other *dramatis personæ* in the centre of the amphitheatre—there are the visitors behind and around her; and there too is the *bell* to ring up the curtain, as it were, and announce the commencement of the performances. And then the report proceeds to describe, in a manner that is truly touching, that "*short, but almost awful silence*" which succeeded "*the little bustle occasioned by seating,*" and which was "*broken by that mild voice which the prisoners "had often heard.*" Nor ought we omit here to mention, that, agreeably to the practice of many other "shew houses" and public exhibitions, "as visitors entered, a book was "presented for them to enter their names."

The chief actress commenced her part, it appears, by reading the twelfth and thirteenth chapters of the Romans; which selection, it is said, "did honour to her judgment;" and when she had finished the chapters, says the writer, "she "remained for a few seconds perfectly silent, and the silence "was *as a silence which might be felt.*" The lady then proceeded to comment on the chapters she had read, and her different observations are described, as having been given "by the *interesting speaker* to her auditory," in a tone of

persuasion, which, adds the reporter, "I shall not easily "forget; and at the conclusion of which, the solemnity "of the scene became *touching* beyond the power of my "description."

The report presents us with a general sketch of the discourse delivered on this occasion, and there is one feature of it, which, inasmuch as it is the common cant of the party, and evidently designed to recommend them to those in authority, we cannot refrain from noticing.

"She touched upon the duty as well as advantage of "'every soul being subject to the *higher powers*, which are "'ordained of God, to be the ministers of God, for good to "'those who do good, but to execute wrath upon them that "'do evil.'"

Now to say nothing of the doubtful authority of the text here cited, or of the preposterous manner in which it is generally explained, we may be permitted to ask, why is not Mrs. Fry *herself* subject unto the higher powers? The present state of our prisons is caused or permitted by them, and yet this lady endeavours to counteract that state of things which is attributable to those whom she professes to think, are ordained of God to be his ministers for good. The ordinary of Newgate is appointed by the *higher powers* to attend to the moral and religious instruction of the prisoners—why then does she interfere with his prerogative and usurp his duties? Upon what pretence is it that this lady performs the duty which is provided for by the *higher powers*, and vested in their legally appointed agent? The ordinary either performs or neglects his duties: if the former, then are Mrs. Fry's services useless; if the latter, then let his inattention become the subject of inquiry or accusation before the proper authorities.

When Mrs. Fry had concluded her discourse, Mr. Sheriff Williams, we are informed, stepped forward to enforce her pious exhortations; after which he informed the prisoners, that the warrant was immediately expected down to remove them to a distant part of the world. This information produced, as may be believed, a corresponding emotion; upon which, says our reporter—

"The worthy sheriff availed himself of this moment of "emotion, to repeat his request, and his hope, that the in-"structions afforded them by these *golden opportunities*, "might not be lost upon them; but that by *fervent prayer*, "by attention, reading, and meditation, they would be pre-

"pared to become *honours to the country* to which they "were going, though they had disgraced themselves so "much in their own; but especially *HE PRAYED for them*, that "*in that world* to which all the living were hastening, they "might be found *in happiness, and in peace*. He then ap-"pealed to their own consciences, whether their former "ways ever afforded them any thing like true satisfactory "pleasure; whether on the contrary, they had not led them "to disgrace! to misery! to confinement! to condemnation! "Yet, added the *kind and condescending sheriff*, your coming "to this sad place, and your obtaining the instruction which "has been given to you, may, by the *blessing of God*, be "among your greatest benefits. *Repent* then, of your "former deeds, and may your latter days be indeed, your "best days."

Professing, as we do, merely

"——— through the loop-holes of retreat
To peep at such a world, ———"

we do not undertake to speak to the history or character of this city sheriff, who is thus represented to us as a preacher of *the gospel of repentance*. We may conclude, however, that he cannot be that well-known worthy gentleman, whom report describes as having first presented himself to the good citizens of London as a radical reformer; as being elected upon the principle of reform to serve the office of sheriff; as rendering himself in that office gracious with the ministers who had approved the Manchester outrage; as being accused of *ratting* by his constituents; as being raised to the bench of Middlesex magistrates; and, finally, as obtaining a *knighthood*. We may conclude that this cannot be the worthy sheriff described as acting with Mrs. Fry in Newgate; or at any rate that the reporter has assigned to him a discourse which he never preached; as the gentleman whose character we have thus sketched from report is understood not to deserve the imputation of being "*righteous overmuch;*" and is represented to us as a shrewd, sensible man, possessed with a good stock of this world's wisdom, and as holding sentiments on the subject of religion —not only in no way consonant with such a display—but as, in fact, *the very reverse, either of fanaticism or credulity*. —Be this as it may, the report informs us—and this no doubt may be believed—that the address of Sheriff Williams "greatly excited the feelings of the convicts, whose sobs "and tears were heard and seen; nor were the visitors

"wholly free from like sensations: this also (adds the "reporter) was a very interesting and solemn scene."*

We trust now we have done sufficient justice to the retiring virtues—"the silent and unassuming labours"—of the ladies' committee in Newgate; and if we have remarked upon the published proceedings of others in the same cause, it is from a conviction that the spirit and character of any public object is to be collected, not merely from a knowledge of the character of its immediate agents, but from an acquaintance with the objects, motives, and habits of its ready patrons and approvers; and, looking generally to the rank, the station, the principles, and character of those who are found in the list of Mrs. Fry's admirers, we may remark, that such were *not* the men, or the parties, who were found to attend the steps, or approve the teaching of the meek and lowly Jesus. We had, indeed, adduced the suspicious circumstance of the almost universal court that was paid to this lady—of the praise with which even the senate resounded her name; and our correspondent, J. F. is so ignorant, so utterly estranged from all knowledge of the precepts of Chirst, as not even to suspect the purpose for which such allusion was made, and to interpret it as a testimony in her favour. If our friend really thinks that the applause of the world will surround the Christian character, and that its possession is the criterion of Christian rectitude—if it be *his* opinion that the world *will* love the disciple when it hated the Lord—if *he* supposes that the praise of this world is *not* enmity with God—if *he* accounts those *blessed* of whom all men shall speak well, we can only reply that—WE "*have* "*not so learned Christ.*" When, however, the praise of the world is thus urged as an evidence of virtue, it may be well to analize the character of that praise, and to determine its value—even *as* human applause.

Let us inquire then into the nature of the praise with which the name of this lady is associated in the senate; let us examine the party from whom it proceeds; let us penetrate their

* Referring again to our plate, as copied from the Hour in Newgate, we may observe, that as the worthy sheriff was omitted in the original, we have thought it but justice to give him a place in our copy. The likeness of Mrs. Fry, and the character of the *Marine missionary*, are better conveyed in our representation than in the original. In other respects the artist has given a faithful copy, although, in one or two of the faces of the *fair penitents*, he has been tempted to throw more of character than the Quaker artist had done. Among the ladies, on one of the upper forms, will be seen the head of a *Magdalen*, which, we confess, appears to us inimitable.

probable motives. It is not, be it observed, the government by whom her services are extolled; it is not the ministers, or the supporters of the ministers, who bepraise her pious endeavours; it is, in fact, a certain knot of canting, self-righteous individuals in the House of Commons, with whom Mrs. Fry is closely identified, and whom a certain political party—*the opposition*, will, for political reasons, occasionally use. The Wilberforces, the Buxtons, the Butterworths, the *saints* of the House, may well be excused for working in the service of their party; but Mr. Brougham and Sir James Mackintosh are not saints; and when such individuals are found to volunteer their praises of the holy sisterhood of Newgate, their conduct at first sight does not appear quite so plain; and as there may be other honest, uninformed persons, who, like J. F., are disposed to consider that such praises can proceed from no other "*possible* "*motive*, except the exalted one that induces a man to stop "on his way to render homage to virtue;" for the benefit of all such be it known that, though Mr. Brougham and Sir James Mackintosh are not saints, they are lawyers, and leading members of the opposition; and when *they* condescend to eulogize the Quaker ladies, it is for the express purpose of using them against the ministers, whose policy they condemn, and whose places they seek. It was formerly the practice with the Whig orators of the day to *work* the Quakers against the ministers on the subject of the slave trade; and now that that topic of declamation is unhappily lost to them, the subject of the criminal laws, and prison discipline of the country, takes its place. Exactly then in this way, and for this purpose, was Sir James Mackintosh's eulogium on the ladies' committee at Newgate used; it was a part of his argument, and subsidiary to his main design of sinking and overwhelming the ministry in disgrace, for the evils of the existing system of prison discipline; which object he could not more effectually promote than by raising those ladies who had so kindly undertaken the correction of such evils. But if we are not very much mistaken, it appears, from certain peculiar turns of expression, used by Sir James on this occasion, as though the orator felt the awkwardness of his subject, and found himself almost on the brink of being ridiculous. Other "*possible motives*" might, indeed, be superadded as an inducement to the orator to tempt so dangerous a subject; for, however *he* might really view the conceit of these prison labours—however forcible *he* might have felt that these ladies were "*engaged in a work that might naturally tempt* "*display*"—however natural it was in *him* to take with him, to

view the Newgate follies, ladies having "*a strong sense of the "ridiculous*"—yet Sir James is neither so simple as not to feel assured that his eulogium on these pious ladies would ensure to him the applause of the whole empire of cant; nor so cynical as to be indifferent as to the possession of such applause. At any rate, if Sir James really admired the proceedings of these pious ladies—if he was sincere in his praise of their endeavours—if his was the spontaneous tribute paid to superior virtue and utility—if his lips

> "——————— chastis'd to truth,
> Ne'er paid that homage which the heart denies,"

it may reasonably be expected that he has used his influence to *assist* these benevolent efforts; and that ere this he has prevailed on *the females of his own family*, and especially those ladies with "*a strong sense of the ridiculous*," to set their hand to the work they so much admired, and to companion with the shop-lifters and prostitutes of Newgate. If he has not done this, the mere eloquence of Sir James, or the holiday applause of his admiring female companions, presents but a slight evidence of the sincerity of their praise, and a poor tribute in favour of the exertions of Mrs. Fry and her female committee.

It is right, however, that the public should know, that the good claimed to have been wrought by these ladies in Newgate, is almost entirely *A DELUSION*. From information derived from well-informed persons, and competent, from their opportunities of judging, to decide, we are justified in saying—this plan has proved a complete failure. Not only are we enabled to state thus much from the opinions of parties in authority, residing in the prison, and having the care and superintendance of the prisoners under their controul—but from a most diligent, active, and sensible lady, employed by the ladies' committee, and selected for her talents, her experience, and habits of business and observation, to an important, official situation under that committee, which she held, as we believe, till her death: from this party, whom, by this description, will be sufficiently known, have we received the frank, though unwilling, admission, *that their endeavours had proved all but fruitless*. And even if the attempt to convert to religion, and to reform to morality, a herd of criminals, guilty of every species of crime—which attempt can only be made in the short interval of their passage through a prison to the gallows, or to the hulks to transportation, or to return again to prey on society—even if the attempt were not itself absurd and impracticable, cer-

tainly no plan that does not emanate from the government —that is not matured by the collective experience, and directed by the united energies of the state—that is not steady and uniform in its operation, and executed by authorized and responsible agents—can promise the most distant chance of success. Besides which the Quakers, as a body, are too little informed, too contracted in their knowledge of human nature, too ignorant of the philosophy of the human mind, to grapple with so difficult, so delicate, an undertaking. The dogmas of their faith also, and the peculiarities of their system, increase their unfitness for such a task. The unphilosophical, unscriptural notion of the natural innate depravity of human nature, and the necessity of the influence of the *inward spirit*, to prompt every good word and work, are striking impediments to the success of any such endeavour in their hands. We have before us the Rules and Regulations of the Ladies' Committee in Newgate, as presented by Mr. Buxton, in his book, to the public. These rules proceed upon *a system of restraints* to the prisoners, not even submitted to by the virtuous; and enforce denials, *which those who impose them do not observe.* How can it be thought consistent with human nature, or in any way possible, that these unhappy persons should pass from the extremes of uncontrouled indulgence, to the shackles of absolute prohibition. Why are the prisoners to be absolutely debarred the use of Spirits? However unnecessary in their general use, and pernicious in their excess, we deem them to be, still, when habit with a giant's strength has, in this particular, obtained its dominion over them, how can these wretched creatures be expected suddenly to emancipate themselves from its influence, and to withhold from their lips the potion which produces a temporary oblivion of despair; and this too when the pious ladies who have been enforcing these rigid rules can go home and drink their refreshing wine? Why, because some novels and plays are improper, are the prisoners to be denied the instruction afforded by the writings of a Richardson, or an Edgworth; or to be excluded from the pleasure of contemplating the world in the perfect mirror of our immortal bard? And what must be the feelings of these unhappy people, if perchance they should look into Mr. Buxton's book, in which the prohibition against the perusal of plays is recorded with approbation, and discover the same to be enriched with quotations from Shakespear? It may be said, indeed, that the adoption of these rules is voluntary on the part of the female prisoners; true, they were so, in the first instance;

but even then they were the necessary condition on which the cares, the attentions, the presents, the clothes, given by Mrs. Fry to these destitute creatures, were to be obtained. Need we wonder then at their pretended acquiesence in such rules? Need we wonder that they should be broken through when opportunity presents? For even the ladies' committee confess, through their agent, Mr. Buxton, "that some of the "rules have been occasionally broken; spirits, they fear, "have more than once been introduced; and it was dis-"covered at one period, *when many of the ladies were absent*, "that card playing had been resumed." (P. 133.) But it appears, from Mr. Buxton's statement, that the city magistrates were afterwards induced to adopt Mrs. Fry's "whole "plan as part of the system of Newgate;" and that, whether legally or not we will not determine, they also "*empowered the ladies to punish the refractory by short confine-"ment;*" so that, what with punishments and presents, it may easily be believed that *good Mrs. Fry* would be able to work miracles upon the female prisoners; and when one of them was asked by Mr. Buxton "if she had done them any good," we can easily believe that the reply which he states did actually follow: "God bless her, and the day she came to Newgate, she has done us all good; and we have, and shall always have, reason to bless her."

The intelligent observer will feel no difficulty in understanding the readiness with which low, ignorant people, deprived of their liberty, will conform to *any* appearances which may suit their interests, without undergoing any real change of character. This sort of low cunning, or convenient adaptation to circumstances, is mistaken by these ladies, or rather perhaps they would have the public mistake it, for —*conversion;* which conversion, they would lead us to believe, the display of their own piety, and the propitious moral atmosphere of a prison, have contributed to produce; for we observe that, when the ladies have assembled the prisoners, they commence their daily business by holding *a silent meeting* before them, "*according to the custom of the "Society of Friends;*" and one of the conclusions to which they profess to have arrived, as the result of their experience in Newgate, is—"that *a prison*, in excluding many objects "of worldly interest, occupation, and pleasure, and in the "pause which it produces in the career of life, and in the "apprehensions it sometimes excites, is well calculated for "*the inculcation of religious impressions.*" Mrs. Fry is perfectly welcome to this field, in which to scatter the seeds of Quakerism; and as, notwithstanding what may be believed

to the contrary, we are of opinion, her conversions are not really *miraculous*, she will no doubt be enabled to obtain as many such as she chooses to pay for. Indeed we observe in the case of the women whom, Mr. Buxton informs us, she induced to *burn their cards*, that "she felt bound to "*remunerate* them for their value; and to mark her sense of "their ready obedience, by *some small present*." But the real question is—How long do these conversions last? Are these parties really changed in the first instance; and when they return again to society, do they exhibit a stable improvement, when neither policy nor interest render it necessary for them to assume even the semblance of virtue? We have heard, upon respectable and competent authority, that being cut off from all means of future support, even those who have undergone the process of conversion by these ladies are generally found to return to their former criminal course of life. This natural result of their labour, the female committee would have the public believe is not *generally* the case. In that report of their proceedings drawn up by themselves, but which they were so fearful of being published "*as coming from them*," it is, indeed, loosely asserted that "Those who leave the prison, and return to common "life, are *mostly*, *more or less*, superintended by some one "member of our committee;" but any such general superintendance it must be wholly *impossible* for individuals to give, to say nothing of the large portion of female prisoners who are sent into that distant colony—that lazaretto of crime—in which we have not as yet heard that any Mrs. Fry has made her appearance. But it is even admitted in this their own report, that "By *too many* of these persons "a continued good conduct has not been maintained." The truth is, the whole scheme is illusory and ridiculous, as such schemes must ever prove, that depend for their success on individual and voluntary exertion. The first effort of this kind that was ever, as we believe, attempted on the felons in Newgate, was by that most persevering, indefatigable, and pains-taking man, Alexander Cruden, author of the Concordance, which bears his name. But poor Cruden was, as it will be remembered, *insane*, which may be some apology for his folly. He had, by his exertions, rescued from the highest penalty of the law, one Richard Potter, who, as it appears, without any criminal intent, had been an instrument in the hands of others; and whilst visiting him in prison, to obtain the evidence of his innocence, he took occasion to instruct him on religious subjects. "The success (says his biographer) Mr. Cruden

"had enjoyed in reforming this poor criminal, induced him "to continue his labours among the other felons in New-"gate. He visited them every day, gave them New Testa-"ments, Catechisms, &c.; catechised them, and bestowed "small pecuniary rewards on the most apt scholar." All this is the very counterpart of Mrs. Fry's plan of operations; and it had the additional advantage of being carried into effect by a party who, we believe, was really sincere. But, adds the writer, "*his labour, however, was lost; the books* "*were soon exchanged for money, and the money spent in* "*drinking; and Cruden discontinued his practice when he* "*found it produced no better effects.*"* Cruden was *only* a madman; he did not unite *hypocrisy* with *insanity;* having, therefore, no motive to uphold a delusion, he abandoned in a lucid interval his unavailing labours. To Mrs. Fry we can only address ourselves—"*Go, and do thou likewise!*"

It might have been expected, if the Newgate plan of reform had been effective—considering also the various other plans for reforming delinquents and converting the lower classes, of whose labours and success the public hear so much—it might have been expected that some sensible good would, by this time, have been experienced; it might have been hoped they would, in some degree, have arrested the progress, and diminished the extent, of crime. Instead of which, according to the official returns just printed, by order of the House of Commons, it appears that the number of persons convicted of crime in England and Wales, for seven years preceding the year 1816, was 29,361; and from 1816 to 1823, the next seven years, the number had increased to 62,043. And that, during the same comparative periods, the number of convictions in London and Middlesex, the immediate theatre of the saintly operations, were 7,421 in the first seven years; and in the last, 11,303. Something, indeed, must be allowed for the increase of population; but we do not apprehend that any view of these dismal records contribute much to the triumphs of cant, and the honour of the saints.

There is a feature connected with the proceedings of the ladies' committee, to which we are desirous of drawing attention, as far as the delicacy of the case will permit us to do so. It appears that not only are females, but even *young females*, engaged in the endeavours to reform the abandoned women of Newgate. It had long since been represented to us, from a quarter in no way unfriendly to Mrs. Fry, that

* Universal Mag., 1789.

this practise had produced extremely pernicious and demoralizing effects on some of the parties thus engaged; we did not, we confess, so readily perceive the connection between the cause and the effect, till the letter of our correspondent, J. F., in defence of this lady, brought it home to our apprehensions. "To effect the reform (says J. F.) contemplated "by the committee, it is necessary to *go to the root and* "*origin of the vice;* to learn *the history* of the criminal; "to mark by what *gradual steps* that criminal proceeded "from misfortune to error—from error to crime; to note "how often a *female criminal has been made such by the crimes* "*of our sex;* to hear, in fact, that SECRET HISTORY *that will* "*not be told to a man.*" In this way then, in studying the progress, and listening to the *secret history*, of seduction, are the mornings of young and inexperienced females employed in Newgate. We confess now, that upon the showing of their own advocate, we can well understand the causes, as we do seriously deplore the consequences, of the evil which has been stated to result from such occupations; and we are of opinion that a case is here presented to our imagination more worthy the interference of "*The Society for the* "*Suppression of Vice,*" than any of their prosecutions of *obscene books*, or *impure prints!**

It must not be supposed, from any reflections thrown out in these papers on the subject of prison discipline, that we are unfriendly to any endeavours to obtain, *through the legislature*, a reform of our prison discipline. Our objection is to *individuals*—generally indiscreet, superficial, interested individuals—taking upon themselves the duties of the executive, and officiously interfering with a work to which they are in no respect competent; and which should be directed by the government of the country alone, under the influence—the salutary influence, we willingly admit, of public opinion! We may not, indeed, go the length of the

* As some of our readers may doubt the possibility of *young females* being permitted to take part in such proceedings, we may quote upon this point, the information given by Mr. Buxton. "The next day she (Mrs. Fry) commenced the school in company with A YOUNG LADY, who then visited a prison for the first time, and who since gave me a very interesting description of her feelings upon that occasion. The railing was crouded with *half naked women*, struggling together for the front situations, with the most boisterous violence, and begging with the utmost vociferation. She felt as if she was going *into a den of wild beasts;* and she well recollects quite shuddering when *the door closed upon her*, and *she was locked in*, with such *a herd of novel and desperate companions.*" (p. 122.) What a misfortune to this young lady and her friends, that these, her first and natural impressions, should ever have been removed by a more regular and familiar intercourse with such "*desperate companions!*"

Quakers, in our wish to see the prisons such houses of comfort—such mansions of hospitality, as to render the criminals within more happy than those without the walls; and to induce others to follow the example of the poor woman recently described by Mr. Hick, chairman of the London Workhouse Committee, who applied to him to know "whether she might not get to Newgate, under the care of "Mrs. Fry, *by stealing a little something*:"* and indeed we think there is some ground for the opinion of a worthy city baronet, who imputed to the Society for the Reformation of Prison Discipline, a wish to provide for the prisoners—"*Turkey carpets and tea and toast.*"

But, doubtless, in the construction of our prisons—in the classification and employment of the prisoners, many important reformations might be attempted; which, as the legislature—and the legislature alone, can effect, the duty of those who profess to deplore the present state of our prisons is plain and obvious. Let them call the attention of parliament to the evil. Let them use their wealth and influence in returning to parliament, men who will support this and all other just and salutary reforms. But above all, let them not, like the Quakers, exhibit the vile hypocrisy of supporting and succumbing to the very men who refuse to redress the evils which they affect so loudly, so feelingly, to lament! We have also, we confess, an insuperable objection to all the endeavours of our modern philanthropists as proceeding on *religious* grounds, and being represented as *Christian duties;* as it is in consequence of such a view of the subject that our prisoners, to the other evils of their situation, are exposed to the constant annoyance, sometimes indeed of well-meant, but generally of hypocritical endeavours to convert and save their souls; endeavours which, however fashionable they may now have become—however pious they may now be held—are more nearly allied to a spirit of hypocrisy and fraud, than consonant with the precepts of Christianity. Jesus never enjoined—his apostles and first followers never practised—such a mode of hawking religion, and forcing a trade in piety; *they* did not take advantage of the distress and destitution of individuals, in order to force upon them the truths of the gospel; *they* did not hunt about for vice in holes and corners of the earth; *they* did not ferret out the inmates of the prison house, to obtain converts to their faith; *they* did not dog the heels of ignorance, and incapacity, and crime, to swell the numbers of their followers; *they* did not seek to

* Times Paper, April 21.

extort the confessions of their faith from the polluted lips of expiring criminals. No! they acted with dignity—with discrimination; excluding, indeed, none from the terms of mercy and pardon; but enforcing the exalted principles of truth on such only as possessed a desire to understand, or a disposition to receive them.

But why, if all this desire for reform, this hatred of sin, this ardour for religion, be sincere—why is it that its manifestations are confined to the *poor only?* Has Mrs. Fry, and her pious supporters and admirers, no sympathy for royal sinners—no concern for titled impenitents? Can she behold unmoved the rich corrupting the springs of public example, and sending down the bitter waters of pollution to the poor? Can she see the high and the mighty enter the broad, wide way that leadeth to destruction—and will she not admonish *them* of their error, and seek to conduct them to the narrow, unfrequented path of life and peace? If such, indeed, shall appear her conduct, and the conduct of her party, then must an appeal to the example of Jesus and his apostles, cover but too many of their pretended followers with shame and confusion of face. "*Woe* "*unto you that are* RICH!" was the exclamation of Jesus;—the party whose principles we have been examining, reserve *their* woes for the *poor* only! When Paul "*reasoned of* "*righteousness, temperance, and judgment to come,* FELIX "*trembled:*"—these truths, however, in the hands of modern teachers, leave higher, greater sinners than Felix, secure in sin, and whilst regardless of the precepts of *righteousness* or the practices of *temperance,* yet are such frequently found among the titled patrons and supporters of the party who affect the deepest interest in the doctrine of—*judgment to come!**

* The following letter, which has been published as from Lord Orford, in answer to an application made to him to become President of the *Norwich Bible Society,* is a striking illustration of the hypocrisy of our modern saints:—

"SIR,—I am surprised and annoyed by the contents of your letter—surprised, because my well-known character should have exempted me from such an application; and annoyed, because it obliges me to have even this communication with *you.* I have long been addicted to the gaming table—I have lately taken to the turf—I fear I frequently blaspheme—but *I have never distributed religious tracts. All this was well known to you and your Society;* notwithstanding which you think me a fit person for your President!—God forgive your hypocrisy—I would rather live in the land of *sinners than with such saints.*" "I am, &c. &c."

We cannot undertake to answer for the genuineness of this letter; but how many of the noble presidents, patrons, and subscribers to our bible societies might not, if they were so disposed, confess as much of themselves as the above noble lord is represented to have done. By the by, Joseph John Gurney is *Secretary to the Norwich Bible Society,* did Friend Joseph, the brother of Elizabeth Fry, make the above application to LORD ORFORD?

In conclusion we have only to remark, that should the Quakers as a body, or the Ladies' committee in Newgate, in particular, feel themselves aggrieved by any thing contained in this paper, they will come forward, either themselves or by some *authorised agent*, publicly to prove in what we have wrongly accused them; and we, on our part, if convinced, will cheerfully confess our error. In the absence, however, of any such attempt on their part, they will by their silence, afford us an additional evidence, that our reasoning has been correct, and our judgment just!

ON RELIGIOUS WORSHIP.—Essay vii.

THE PRAYER OF THE JEWISH TEMPLE.

"What is man?
Where must he find his Maker? with what rites
Adore him? Will he hear, accept, and bless?
Or does he sit regardless of his works?
—'Tis Revelation satisfies all doubts."—*Cowper's Task, Book II.*

We are engaged in an examination of the worship of the Jewish temple, with a view to prove that public social prayer was not practised therein. In the two preceding Essays we have shewn that prayer formed no part of the public and appointed worship of the Jews. The fifth Essay (p. 46) explained the duties of the priests; the sixth (p. 162) those of the levites; the one were appointed to sacrifice to, the latter to sing the praises of, Jehovah, as the God and the king of the Jews; but neither, as we have seen, were appointed or commanded to pray; or to lead the public or joint prayer of the people. Prayer, indeed, was never *commanded* to the Jewish people at all: it is never spoken of as a duty (p. 51): it was simply *permitted* to them as an advantage—*allowed* them as a privilege; and it was permitted and allowed to those only who were worthy of this advantage, and who chose to avail themselves of this privilege: it *must*, therefore, have been individual; whereas

sacrifice and the singing of the levites were expressly appointed and commanded as public, stated, and national observances.

In reply to those who contend (as Lewis, Bennett, Moore, and others, see p. 47) that *social* prayer formed part of the temple worship, it might be sufficient to call upon them to produce the passages, the chapters, and the verses, in which this observance is commanded, and the officers appointed to conduct it; or let them, if they cannot do this, produce plain and palpable cases in which *social* prayer is practised; or, failing in that, let them produce passages in which the Jewish people are extolled for the observance; or censured for the neglect; or admonished for the abuse of the practice. Not one such have been, or can be, produced; *all* these can be produced with regard to the national sacrifices of the Jews; but not a single passage can be produced in which public social prayer is commanded; or in which its non-observance is censured; or its abuses pointed out. This is, at least, strong *inferential* argument that public social prayer formed no part of the worship of the Jewish temple.

With *inferential* argument we shall not, however, be content in this case; we shall produce positive and conclusive evidence, to shew—not, indeed, that prayer was not *practised* in the Jewish temple, for that it is part of our case to insist that it was—but that such prayer was *permitted*, not *commanded;* that it formed no part of the stated ritual and observances of the court of Jehovah; and that, above all, and as a consequence of all, that it was *individual and separate*—not joint and social; that they had not "*liturgies* "*or prescribed forms*," as some have contended; but that, in the language of Prideaux, (himself an orthodox priest, and a defender of public social prayer) that "all prayed in "private to themselves, and all according to their own "private conceptions."

The temple is spoken of by the prophet Isaiah as being "*a house of prayer*;" and such, indeed, it was; but upon this epithet, occurring, as it does, ONCE ONLY in all the books of the Old Testament, by far too much stress has been laid; an endeavour having been made to establish an inference, that prayer—stated and social prayer—was the chief end and object of the Jewish temple; in the performance of which the whole of its officers, priests, levites, &c. assisted. "One of the chief distinctions of the temple, "then, (observes Mr. Moore, Inquiry, p. 49) was this: it was "denominated by God himself—NOT A HOUSE OF SACRIFICE,

"but a house of prayer." Now we beg the reader to turn to the passage referred to, (Isaiah 56—7) and he will find that, had it been fairly quoted, sacrifice would have been seen to form a leading part of the prophet's reference. "*Even the sons of the stranger will I bring to my holy mou-*" *tain, and make them joyful in my house of prayer;* THEIR "BURNT OFFERINGS AND THEIR SACRIFICES SHALL BE "ACCEPTED UPON MINE ALTAR." But more than this: Mr. Moore, desirous to deprecate the sacrifice of the Jews' temple, and to make its prayer appear as all in all, asserts that this house was "*denominated by God himself*—NOT "A HOUSE OF SACRIFICE." We have further to direct the reader's attention to 2 Chronicles, vii. 12, where it is related that God himself—"*the Lord appeared to* "*Solomon by night, and said unto him I have heard thy* "*prayer, and have chosen this place to myself for—a* HOUSE "OF SACRIFICE!" We chiefly notice a circumstance of this kind, as evidence of a weak cause, and as one amongst numberless instances which might be cited to shew that those who take the side of the question maintained by Mr. Moore, stand directly opposed to the evidence and testimony of scripture.

If prayer, as conducted in modern times, by self-named priests, either with or without "*liturgies or prescribed forms,*" was used in the temple, there must have been officers and ministers appointed to conduct it. Who were these officers and ministers? By what name are they called? In what part of the Jewish law do we find their appointment? The priests, as we have shewn, were the ministers of state; *their* employment was in the *interior* of the temple, where the people were not allowed to enter; and where, in fact, from the smallness of its size, they could not enter; *or* they were employed—not in leading the prayers of the people —but in the appointed sacrifices. The levites, as we have also shewn, were employed—(not in prayer)—but in songs, filled with praises and thanksgivings to the king, who resided in the temple: praises and thanksgiving, too, in which the people were not allowed to join. For conducting the supposed social or joint prayer of the people, there remained, then, no appointed officer whatever. So strong is the evidence on this subject, that Mr. Moore himself, aware of the fact, is driven to find a *reason* for it. "*If* (he says, p. 58) "they had no priest or minister to lead their devotions, *the* "*reason* appears to be this:" and he then goes on to state the reason, and an excellent one it certainly is—that the

priests were employed in offering incense, whilst the people were *without* praying; that is, as we shall hereafter shew, in the outer courts of the temple, offering up their individual and separate prayer. But surely this is a strange admission on the part of Mr. Moore: "*if* they had no priest or "minister to lead their devotions!" Surely one single priest or minister could have been spared for this important purpose; but, no! Mr. Moore is compelled to admit—not a single priest or minister was appointed for that observance which, in modern times, is represented, and by Mr. Moore is considered, as of all others the most important. How is it, we may ask, that numerous officers are appointed, and the most minute directions given for that which Mr. Moore scarcely notices—and never represents as worthy of our imitation—*sacrifice;* and yet that not one single officer should be appointed, and not one single direction given, respecting that which is regarded as the most important; and which is moreover triumphantly adduced as a matter for *our* imitation? But Mr. Moore must have felt that this concession —that there were "*no priests or ministers to conduct the devo-* "*tions of the people*" in the temple, was fatal to the cause which he was defending. And how does he conquer the difficulty? By boldly, in other parts, asserting the direct contrary of that which he is here compelled to concede! "From the whole of this account, (he infers, p. 56) it is "evident that the entire service of the temple was not only "public—but as social as possible. It was the service of "the whole people—CONDUCTED BY OFFICERS APPOINTED "FOR THIS PURPOSE." Thus also (p. 44) he commences the section on the religious services in the temple, by stating that they "consisted of sacrifices and offerings, the "reading of the law, PRAYERS, and sacred music, both "vocal and instrumental. For EACH department of these "services NUMEROUS OFFICERS WERE APPOINTED, whose "stated employment it was to conduct them with great "exactness, and latterly with equal superstition." Here, then, we find Mr. Moore opening his subject, by stating that there were "*numerous officers appointed, whose stated em-* "*ployment it was to conduct* (amongst other observances) *the* "*PRAYERS of the people;*" and yet we find this same writer, four pages further on in his work, (p. 48) arguing that, "THOUGH public prayer, any more than the reading of the "law, might not be considered, by the high priest, as any "part of the duty over which he presided, BECAUSE NO "DIRECTIONS ARE GIVEN RESPECTING IT BY THEIR LAW-

" GIVERS, as there are in the case of sacrifices and offer-
" ings; and THOUGH THERE MIGHT BE NO MINISTERS OF
" THE TEMPLE, WHOSE BUSINESS IT WAS TO CONDUCT
" THE DEVOTIONS OF THE PEOPLE; yet it is certain—not
" only that prayer from the first always constituted a pro-
" minent and material part of the services of the temple—
" but that it was practised under a divine sanction." *

Leaving it to Mr. Moore, and to the other practisers and defenders of the cause, to explain how it was that the priests were employed in conducting the prayer of the people—*if* they were, at the same time, otherwise employed, and *though* they were not appointed for that purpose—we shall now proceed directly to inquire what *was* the prayer of the Jewish temple. With Mr. Moore we allow that, for public (that is, social) prayer, " there are no directions given " by the Jewish lawgivers;" and it follows, as an inevitable consequence, (to the utter destruction of all Mr. Moore's arguments on the subject) that that temple prayer, which " was practised under a divine sanction," was *individual*—and *not* social.

To the *dedication* (as it is called) of the temple, we now purpose to turn; and we think that what is recorded of that circumstance, will be found most incontestably to prove that the future prayer of that place was to be separate and individual—not joint and social. Up to this period we have seen (p. 50) that the object proposed by

---

* As the Unitarians are strong advocates for public social prayer, some with, and some without " liturgies and prescribed forms;" and as Mr. Moore's book has been described in the organ of the Unitarian body (the Monthly Repository) as a *judicious*, *satisfactory*, and *valuable* book; which the editor *recommends*, and for which he *bespeaks the favour of his readers*, we beg to put in *juxta position* the following assertions of their favourite writer, with the pages of his work, for more easy reference:—

P. 43. That there were officers appointed to conduct social worship, of prayer and praise, among the Jews.

P. 48. That public prayer is *not* directed in the scriptures; and that there were *no* ministers, whose business it was to conduct it.

P. 44. That numerous officers were appointed to conduct prayer in the temple.

P. 56. That the service of the whole people was conducted by officers appointed for this purpose.

P. 58. That, being otherwise employed, *no* priest or minister led their devotions.

If not a judicious, *we* at least have found this a *satisfactory* book; and we would *recommend* it to the attention of all who wish to see the *strong* reasons in favour of social prayer.

David, and afterwards by Solomon, in building the temple, was to prepare a house for the ark, before which house the children of Israel were to offer up burnt offerings and other sacrifices; nothing is, at that time, said of prayer—either individual or social. In the description of the building, and of its several parts which are extant, there is evidently a view to *these* objects; but no view to prayer. Thus much for the intention, and the plan of the building. We come now to its completion, to its opening, to its "*dedication.*" Solomon is represented (1 Kings, vii. 12) as making a speech, or oration, in which the objects of the temple are described; he then, "*standing before the altar of the Lord,*" (that altar which just before had been distinguished by a miraculous manifestation of the presence of God) "*in the "presence of all the congregation of Israel, spreads forth his hands "towards heaven.*" It is here that we find the first notice of the temple as a peculiar place of prayer. Solomon makes it a request to Deity that, having performed the covenant with his father, in permitting the erection of a house in which he would dwell, he should add a *further* blessing by listening, in an especial manner, to the prayers and petitions of such as should offer them up, in or towards that place. "*That thine eyes may be open toward this house "night and day, even toward the place of which thou has said, "My name shall be there: and hearken thou to the supplication "of thy servant, and of thy people Israel, when they shall "pray* TOWARD *this place; and hear thou in heaven, thy dwelling "place; and when thou hearest, forgive.*" (V. 30.) The prayer, for which peculiar efficacy is thus solicited, is then, to be addressed *in* or *toward* this place—not for the purposes of sociality or publicity (purposes which could be equally answered elsewhere)—but because God had allowed that his name should be in that place. Neither is such prayer to be social at all; still less is it to be the stated and imperative duty of all the people, at all times, as is the case with social prayer in our own age. It is to be the peculiar place of prayer (whether regular or occasional) to those who, from pious feelings, or extraordinary circumstances, might, in that place, be led to offer up their petitions before the throne of God.* If a man had trespassed against his neighbour (v. 31)—if Israel were smitten before the enemy

* There is, on one point, here ground for a slight difference of opinion, which, however, in no way affects our argument. In a future part of this Essay it will be shewn that a practice prevailed amongst the Jews (a practice

—if the heavens were shut up, and there were no rain—if there were famine in the land, or pestilence, blasting, mildew, locust, or any plague, or sickness, then, and in all similar cases, it is the request of Solomon—what?—that the Lord shall listen to the joint prayers of the people; to liturgies and prescribed forms; or, to the extemporaneous effusions of the priest, in the name of the people: in a word —to public social prayer? No! but "*what prayer and supplication shall be made by* ANY MAN, *or by all thy people Israel, which shall know every man the plague of* HIS OWN HEART," (and, of course, shape his petitions accordingly) "*and spread forth his hands towards this house, then hear thou in heaven, thy dwelling place, and forgive, and do, and give to every man according to his ways, whose heart thou knowest.*" The whole tendency of this is to shew that the prayer contemplated by Solomon was separate, not joint; that it was personal, not social, prayer. This is even more strongly evidenced by the next case which he adverts to: that of "*the stranger who cometh out of a far country*"—*his* prayer, too, it is requested, may be heard in or toward that house; yet surely *his* prayer must have been peculiar; *he* could not have joined in the prayer of the temple, if that prayer had been the national and stated prayer of the Jewish nation.

The whole argument, as to the sociality of the prayer contemplated by Solomon in the temple, appears to be built upon the mistaken idea that he wished the Jews to *assemble and congregate together* in this one spot, for the purpose of prayer; a position which, in various ways, we have had frequent occasion before incidentally to combat. We must, however, *again* say—that the Jewish monarch evidently wished the temple he had built to be peculiarly consecrated to prayer—to individual prayer—*not* for the purpose of publicity—but because that building was the chosen and peculiar house of God. Hence prayer was

---

which may be traced up to an age certainly not long after the institution of the temple) of offering their prayers individually, indeed, but at stated times—that is, at three times in the day; hence called the hours of prayer. Whether this practice was of divine appointment or not—whether it originated in the time of Solomon, or sprung up afterwards, as it may naturally enough be supposed to have done, is a point upon which there may be difference of opinion, and respecting which we cannot now expect to arrive at a certain conclusion. Thus much, however, will, we believe, be made evident in the course of this Essay: that the prayer of the people in the temple, whether offered up at stated hours, or otherwise, was always individual.

to be offered up—not so much *in*, as *toward* that house. "*If they were besieged in the land of their cities*" (v. 37, when approach to Jerusalem might be impossible)—if they were "*sent out to battle against the enemy*" (v. 44)—if they were "*carried away captive, far or near*"—yet, if they did but pray *towards* the land of their fathers—the city which had been chosen—the house which had been built for the name of God, then their monarch intercedes for them, that their prayer should be heard, and their cause maintained. All this is perfectly intelligible, if the wish and the object of Solomon were that God should listen to all those of his people who, knowing each the plague of his own heart, should feel disposed (whether "*far or near*") to address the throne of their God and King with their *individual* petitions; but it is perfectly unintelligible, nay, it is gross inconsistency, if Solomon expected that all these parties, under all these circumstances of peace or war, freedom or captivity, vicinity or distance, should assemble together on Mount Zion, for the purposes of joint and social prayer.*

Here, then, we contend, that we have the nature of the temple prayer described from the lips of the builder and the founder of the temple; a better authority, surely, upon such a subject, than Maimonides, and all the tribe of rabbinical writers—than the Jewish Talmud, and the glosses upon the Talmud, which, from Lightfoot down to Moore, have been triumphantly quoted, in order to prove that *joint* prayer was commanded and practised in the Jewish temple. In noticing the dedicatory prayer of Solomon, we have hitherto abstained from making one remark which is not without its importance to this subject; namely, that the petition of Solomon (besides that it describes the future

* In by far the greater number of cases the prayer must have been made *toward*, not *in*, the temple, or even its courts. That this direction was *not* for the purpose of the sociality of prayer, may be thus illustrated: The people of England, who are members of the establishment, are called upon to offer up their prayers—not "in or towards" St. Paul's, whether they are "far from or near" to the metropolis; *they* are directed (the object being *social* prayer) to go to the church nearest them—to their own parish church, in order that they may meet their neighbours, and join in public *social* prayer. Such was not the case with the Jews; they were called on, or rather allowed, present or distant, to offer their prayers, consequently their separate, their individual prayers, in or toward *one* spot—the temple; that would have been a singular congregation for social prayer, which included all the children of Israel, from Dan even unto Beersheba; nay, which included the captive and the stranger, and the traveller in foreign and in distant lands. Well might there be no priest to "conduct the devotions" of *such* a congregation!

prayer of the temple as being individual) is itself (whatever may be hazarded to the contrary)—*an individual prayer.* The force of this remark will be seen if we compare the *form* of speech attributed to Solomon on this occasion, with that which would be adopted in our own times, by a priest or minister, whether established or dissenting, at the consecration of what are called our modern temples—that is, our churches or chapels. Although the whole of the prayer of Solomon is in the singular number, on these occasions, we shall invariably find the prayers of the modern priesthood to be in the plural.

It is curious to see the caution with which those who contend for the social prayer of the Jewish temple approach this important document—the dedicatory prayer of Solomon. Mr. Moore, in a work of 150 pages, appropriates to it nineteen lines only, (p. 36); even in these he does not advert to its most important feature—the description which it contains of the *future* prayer of the temple, by the children of Israel; but he does assert, or at any rate wishes it to be inferred, that the specific prayer used by Solomon on this occasion, was a *social* one. "Solomon's dedication of the "temple was (he says, 36) an instance of *public* devotion, "and the account of it contains a prayer delivered by him-"self, in a general assembly of the people; and though it "is not said that the whole congregation added their *amen* "at the conclusion, yet, whenever a solemn prayer is thus "addressed to God in a public assembly, those who are "present are *always considered* as taking a part in the act, "as it was *perfectly natural and proper* for them to do on "this occasion. From the whole account, indeed, *we can* "*scarcely avoid inferring* that the people concurred in this "public act of worship." Whether or not those who are present should be *always considered* as joining in prayer, thus making it social, is the very matter in dispute, and therefore to assume it is to beg the question.* That it was *perfectly natural and proper* on this occasion, for the whole people socially to join with their king in this particular prayer, we must most unhesitatingly deny.

* A friend, who has seen our manuscript, suggests here an illustration: Observe—it is one thing to *desire* the fulfilment of a petition made by another for our good, and another to join in the *act* of making that petition. If *we* were to petition parliament to grant emancipation to the Catholics, they would *desire* the fulfilment, and *agree* with the object of the petition; but it would not be *their* petition, even though they should be present when it was presented.

The prayer as will be seen, on reference to it, is not only in the singular number, but it is peculiarly and emphatically the prayer of Solomon, the son of David; it is the *personal* prayer of the builder of that house, in which it is not enough to say that the people *did* not—but in which the people *could* not—join him. He commences, with a reference to his father David. Are the people to be *considered* as joining in this reference? (p. 24.) He next adverts to himself, as the promised son of David, who was to sit on the throne of Israel: is it "*perfectly natural and proper*" for the people whom he reigned over to join with him in this allusion? Every subsequent part of his prayer is founded upon the fact, that he is the builder of that house, respecting which his petitions are offered up. Is it from this circumstance that we can *scarcely avoid inferring* that the people concurred in this public act of worship? A candid view of the whole will prevent the possibility of any other *inference*, but that this prayer, the first offered up in the Jewish temple, and that upon which the whole of the prayer of the Jewish temple was founded, (however the people assembled might *desire* its fulfilment) is strictly, in the closest sense of the words—an *individual*—not a *social*—prayer.*

Thus much for what may be called the *institution* of the prayer of the Jewish temple. We will now proceed to inquire, with the aid of the scripture of the Old, and, as far as they bear upon the subject, of the New Testament—what was the after practice of the Jews in this respect. We turn then to the recorded cases of prayer in the temple, for the purpose of discovering whether these are cases of individual, or of social prayer. In order to simplify this

* Mrs. Letitia Barbauld (p. 28 of her reply to Gilbert Wakefield) takes up another ground to prove this *individual* prayer of Solomon to have been a *social* one. "The whole people (she says) bore a part in the worship by THE RESPONSE—'*For he is good; for his mercy endureth for ever.*'" The reader will perhaps be surprised, on turning to the passage, (2 Chron. vii. 3) to find this *response* to be worse than an Irish echo, as it has *no connection whatever* with the original, to which it is described as responding. The exclamation was a common, we may almost say a proverbial, expression amongst the people; and it was called forth—*not by the prayer of Solomon*—but by an event which happened "*when Solomon had made an end of prayer;*" (v. 1) namely, a miraculous manifestation of the presence of God. Mr. Moore (p. 36) also speaks of this exclamation as occurring *at the end of the service!* By mistake he attributes it to the singers instead of the people. It was, in fact, a natural exclamation from the lips of a people so circumstanced at the sight of a miraculous event; and when *we* are so circumstanced, and are present at an event of this description, such an exclamation would proceed with equal appropriateness from our lips.

inquiry, we would observe that, in the temple, or its courts, as in the tabernacle, (see Vol. I. 332) there are two kinds of petition recorded as offered up; the *first* may be called national, or political petitions, which were offered up by the rulers, the priests, or the kings, as in the immediate presence of God, and in the expectation of a consequent miraculous reply; the *second* may be regarded as *personal* petitions, or prayers, which were offered by individuals in their own name, and which generally bore reference to their own separate wishes and interests. The former of these we will first briefly consider. Some of these have, most unfairly, been brought to support the present practice of public social prayer. We say unfairly, because, in the first place, they were not *social*, the priest, or ruler, offering up the petition as *his own*, in favour of the people, (who, for the most part, were not present) and not as their mouthpiece, expressing *their* prayer, as in the modern practice, they being, in fact, prayers—not *of* the people—but *for* the people; and, in the second place, because the circumstances and the belief of the Jews, which led to this practice, are wholly without parallel in modern events, and in our own times. All that we have said in a former Essay, (Vol. I. p. 332) as to the *political* communion which took place between Jehovah and the Jewish rulers before the ark of the covenant, applies, of course, with equal force to the temple, as it did to the tabernacle; each being successively the place of deposit of that ark. Of the tabernacle, we have seen it observed, by an author of authority on this subject, (Lewis, Origines Hebræ, b. iii. c. 4) "that it was called the "tabernacle of meeting—not because this was the place where "the people met together for divine worship, as is commonly "supposed — *but because God there met with men, and* "*revealed his will to them.*" The temple also was, in this sense of the phrase, *a place of meeting*. But cases of this kind (which are to be compared rather to a cabinet council, in which the ministers approach to know the will of their monarch) are carefully to be distinguished from the prayers (popularly so called) of the people. Of this kind was the petition of David, (2 Sam. vii. 18, and 1 Chron. xvii. 6) with regard to the future temple, when it is said that "*the king* "*came and sat before the Lord.*" That of Hezekiah, (2 Kings, xix. 14) who, when he had received a threatening and blasphemous letter from Sennacherib, (see also 2 Chron. xxxii. 9) "*went up to the house of the Lord, and spread it* "*before the Lord, and prayed.*" That of Jehoshaphat,

(2 Chron. xx. 5) who addressed the Lord in the congregation of Judah and Jerusalem in the house of the Lord, before the new court, on the approach of the Moabites and the Ammonites, and who received a miraculous answer, (the spirit of the Lord falling on one of the levites) pointing out the mode in which the enemy was to be defeated.* And of this kind probably was the case of the men alluded to in the Book of Zechariah, (chap. vii. 2) who are spoken of as being sent, during the captivity, "*unto the house of God, to pray* "*before* (or to entreat the face of) *the Lord.*"

Having thus cleared the way, by noticing cases which are really not instances of prayer at all, in the modern acceptation of that term—but cases of consultation of the Jewish monarch, by the rules of the Jewish people, in the expectation of a miraculous reply, we can proceed to examine what is properly and strictly the prayer of the Jewish people in their temple, our question being—was that prayer social or individual?

The nature of the temple prayer, and the form and circumstaces under which it was offered up, will be rendered more clear by a description of the building, and of the courts appended to it, or by which it was surrounded. The temple itself, strictly speaking, was small in size, being calculated to be fifty cubits in breadth, one hundred in length, and thirty-six in height, the cubit being two feet English measure, nearly; but it was surrounded by spacious courts, making a square of half a mile in circumference. Though these courts were afterwards subdivided into many, (as the gentile's court, the women's court, &c.) yet we learn that the courts of the temple were, at first, but two only. Of these it was the *outer* court, or area surrounding the temple that was called the *people's* court, and in which they were permitted to assemble during the sacrifices, &c. This court appears to have been surrounded by walls, on the top of which were built chambers, or galleries, supported by the wall on the outer side, and by rows of columns on the inner; the piazzas, or porches, thus formed having been illustrated by a comparison with those in our Royal

* This case of consultation of the Deity, one of extreme and pressing danger, in which "*all Judah stood before the Lord, with their little ones, their* "*wives, and their children;*" in which the king avowedly appears before God, in conformity with the contract between Jehovah and the people, and in which a miraculous reply is expected and received, is actually brought by the defenders of social prayer in support of that practice.—See Moore, p. 33, and Pope's reply to G. Wakefield, p. 37.

Exchange, or in Covent Garden. When the people had entered this court, or area—as they passed on—a low wall presented itself before them, over which they could see into the *inner*, or *priest's* court, where stood the brazen altar, and the other utensils for sacrifices. Beyond this altar was discovered the porch, and behind that the temple itself, consisting chiefly of the holy place, or sanctuary, and of the holy of holies. The space between the altar and the porch is spoken of as peculiarly devoted to the priests. The levites stood behind them, chiefly upon the stairs of the porch, or portico, of the temple, singing and playing upon musical instruments.*

We have been thus particular in describing the temple and its courts, in order to shew that the people were *separate*, and it may be even said *distant*, from the priests and the levites, in whose sacred and appointed offices indeed they were allowed to take no part. Such of the people then as prayed in the temple necessarily offered up their devotions in this *outer* court; in the porches (or piazzas) by which it was surrounded; or, in the chambers which were erected above those porches. Such prayers were, it is stated, offered up at the hours of sacrifice, and whilst the priests were offering incense. That the time of prayer was not confined to this period is, however, certain; as we find no *command* for the practice, and as no *early* instance of it is named, we have no reason for believing that the appointment of this specific time for prayer was of divine origin. The practice, however, was a natural one, fairly arising from the circumstances of the case, and prevailed—not only in the latter periods of the Jewish history—but would appear alluded to more than once in the prophetical writings. "It being well understood" (observes Prideaux, p. 1. b. 6) "that the offering up of the daily

* For descriptions of the temple and its courts, see, besides the scriptures of the Old Testament, Godwin's Moses and Aaron, b. ii. chap. 1.; Jenning's Hebrew Antiquities, b. ii. chap. 1.; Lewis's Origines Hebræ, v. i. 334; and Fleury's Short History of the Israelites, part ii chap. 16. If we would illustrate the *geography* of the temple by a reference to a building, which, according to the position of Bishop Beveridge and others, is of *superior* sanctity, St. Paul's, in London, we must first observe that the building of the latter is very greatly indeed larger than its *inferior* model of Jerusulem. If we place the levites as on the steps of the western portico of St. Paul's, the priests would be employed in sacrifices in the space between those steps and the statute of Queen Ann. The people would be placed *without* the rails extending towards Ludgate Hill. The parallel spot in Jerusalem was, as we have seen, enclosed and surrounded by piazzas, or porches.

"sacrifices, and the burning of incense upon the altar of "incense, at the time of these sacrifices, was for the render-"ing of God propitious unto them, and making their "prayers to be acceptable in his presence; they were very "careful to make the times of those offerings, and the times "of their prayers, both at the temple and every where else, "to be exactly the same." And he is particular in wishing it clearly to be seen that the people, on these occasions, were praying "*for themselves;*" that is—not through the medium of a priest; the priests, indeed, being engaged in the inner court, in sacrificing. His language is precise: "but neither of these had any public forms to pray by, nor "any public ministers to officiate to them herein; but all "prayed in private to themselves, and all according to their "own private conceptions;" and then, seeing the necessity of meeting the cavils of some of those (Lightfoot and others) who were, like himself, defenders of social prayer—but who went further than he did, in contending that social prayer was the practice of the Jewish temple—he adds, in a note, "If there *were* any stated forms for this worship, they were "only *as helps* for those who prayed in the temple, *which* "*every one offered up for himself, without a public minister.*"*

That the date of the origin of the practice in question (that of praying at fixed hours *in* or *towards* the temple) is uncertain, we have already observed; that such practice commenced at the time of Solomon, and with the first opening of the temple itself, is by no means improbable; as, to the pious and well-regulated mind, the privilege of prayer would, at all times, be valuable and important; and the times of

---

* The Jewish hours of prayer, in later times, were the third, sixth, and ninth hours, corresponding with our nine, twelve, and three o'clock; the first and last being the hours of morning and evening sacrifice. Bishop Beveridge, in his "Necessity and Advantage of Public Prayer," refers us on this subject to Ex. xxix. 39; Numb. xxviii. 4; compared with Josephus, b. xiv. chap. 8. To shew that the people prayed, and were assembled in great numbers, at the hours of sacrifice, he cites Luke i. v. 9—10; Rev. viii. 3—4; Lev. i. 9; Acts ii. 15—41, and iv. 4. These things, he says, were written for *our* admonition; and he exhorts his readers also to go to places dedicated to God's service—*such as the temple was in Jerusalem!* To act on this exhortation the people should, as we have seen, pray on Ludgate Hill, whilst the Bishop of London and his clergy are offering up *sacrifices* within the railings of St. Paul's church-yard. Lightfoot says that a large bell gave notice to the inhabitants of the city when their incense was about to be offered; and that, when offered, all the people in the court began their prayers. Moore (note 31) observes that "prayer, at the time of sacrifice, was also a common practice among heathen nations; instances of which occur in Homer's Odyss. lib. iii. 447—450; ix. 34; xiv. 423; and in Virgil's Æn. lib. xii. 175, b. 247."

sacrifice would occur to the worshipper of Jehovah as being the natural and appropriate hour for prayer, in the same manner that the morning and the evening (as being the beginning and end of the labours of the day) would occur, in our times, to a member of the family of God: perhaps even with greater force; for, believing in the immediate presence of Jehovah, the Jew would be naturally led to regard him as peculiarly *propitious* (to use the expression of Prideaux) at that moment, when the appointed worship (of sacrifice) was offered before him. The *court* of the monarch, as it were, was then held—that might well be deemed the moment best fitted for the presenting petitions at his footstool. The practice of praying at the hour of sacrifice is, we believe, first noticed in the case of Elijah, (1 Kings xiii. 36) who, in his contest with the priests of Baal, is described as praying to God "*at the time of the offering of the evening* "*service.*" It will not be said that this was social prayer; neither was it offered up *in*—though probably *toward*—the temple. Ezra (chap. ix. 5) is described, when oppressed by a sense of the sins of the people, as arising from his heaviness *at the time of the evening sacrifice,* and as falling upon his knees, and spreading out his hands unto the Lord his God. Did he, on this occasion, join the social prayer of the temple; or did he conduct it? Neither! his prayer is *individual;* he said "*O my God, I am ashamed, and blush* "*to lift up my face to thee my God.*" The most complete exemplification which can be given of the then practice of the Jews, both as to prayer at the hours of sacrifice, and *toward* the temple, is the instance recorded of Daniel, (chap vi. 10) after he had learned the decree of Darius—that none should ask a petition of any god or man for thirty days. "*He went into his house; and his windows being open* "*TOWARD Jerusalem, he knelt upon his knee—three times a day,* "*and prayed, and give thanks before his God, AS HE DID* "*AFORETIME.*" In this case, which particularly describes the stated conduct of a pious Jew, we find every thing which supports our views as to the nature of the prayer of the Jewish temple. It was prayer *toward* Jerusalem; but though even stated prayer, it *must* have been individual. This case, if there were no other extant, would suffice of itself, to prove that prayer was not—could not have been offered *in* or *toward* the temple, for the purpose of being joint and social. The same prophet (Daniel ix. 21) adverts to his "*speaking in prayer, at the time of the evening oblation.*" The first chapter of Luke describes with precision the

mode of prayer prevalent when it was written; whatever this passage may lack in authenticity, and we admit its want of authenticity, still, as recording historical events respecting Jesus, it cannot be supposed that the forger would have thrown discredit on his own narration, by giving other than a correct description of manners and customs so well known as those in question. Of Zechariah, the supposed father of John the Baptist, it is said that "while he executed the priest's office before God in the "order of his course, *according to the custom of the priest's* "*office*, his lot was to burn incense when he went into the "temple of the Lord." This was the duty of the priest. How, in the mean time, were the people employed, and where were they assembled? "*And the whole multitude of* "*the people were praying* WITHOUT, *at the time of incense.*" How perfectly does this agree with the concurrent testimony both of the scriptures, and of all well-informed writers on the subject, that the people prayed, not *in* the temple, with the priests to conduct their devotions, but WITHOUT, that is, in the outer court; the priests, in the mean time, being employed, *according to the custom of their office*, in offering sacrifices on the altar, and incense in the temple!

Of the apostles Peter and John it is *incidentally* recorded, (Acts iii. 1) that they "*went up together into the temple at the* "*hour of prayer, being the ninth hour.*" That the mention of the time is *incidental* merely, is evident from the narration which follows; yet of this circumstance much has been made by the defenders of social prayer.* "*Was this*"

---

* As an instance of the ridiculous length to which the perversion of scripture is carried by priests, in order to support their personal objects, and interested systems, the reader may take the following comments on the passage above quoted. Beveridge, bishop of St. Asaph, in his "*Great Necessity and Advantage of Public Prayer*," quoting the passage, that Peter and John went up to the temple "*at the hour of prayer*," observes, (p. 6) "I see no reason why this should be so *minutely* recorded, but only to teach us, that though the levitical law expired altogether with our Saviour, *yet the public worship of God ought still to be kept up at certain times and places set apart for it.*" The *object* of the writer in recording this *minute* account (consisting of a single line) would appear also to have been well known to the reverend bishop.—"And this (he says) is left upon record, *that Christians of all ages may know it*, and learn by their apostolic example, to lay hold of all opportunities they can get of performing their public devotions to Almighty God in such places, and at such times as are appointed for that purpose:" and he elsewhere (p. 27) has the impudence to assert, "that it is left on record, that the apostles went up to the temple at the hour of prayer, ON PURPOSE *that the church in all ages might learn to set aside some certain times*

(inquires Mr. Pope, p. 66) "*no public worship?*" The question is, we confess, a startling one, and that from the utter want of foundation upon which it is built. Nothing whatever is said in the passage about worship of any kind. Still, however, as it is highly probable, though it is not so expressed, that prayer *was* their object, let us assume, for the sake of argument, that they visited the temple for that purpose—surely it was not *social* prayer that they sought there. Is it meant to be asserted or insinuated, that they went to the temple to join in the public and social prayers of the Jewish nation, even if such existed, which we have proved was not the case? Of that people who had rejected the messiah and murdered their master? The same question applies to another not dissimilar case: "When the "disciples (observes Mr. Moore, p. 111) had been spec-"tators of the ascension of their venerated master, they re-

---

every day in the year for public prayer; accordingly *as* the Jewish church had by God's own appointment the morning and evening sacrifices every day in the year, *so* all Christian churches have been used to have their morning and evening prayers performed every day." The reader, perhaps, is by this time prepared to hear, that the apostles went up to the temple ON PURPOSE to induce the good people of Wales to pay tithes to the right reverend the bishop of St. Asaph. Something not far short of this is actually declared:—"For our churches now are as solemnly dedicated to the service of God, (impudent falsehood!) and therefore are as much his houses of prayer, as even the Jewish synagogues were, *or the temple itself!*"—"We cannot doubt, but that all the promises which he made of meeting and blessing his people *in such places* were *intended for and belong to us, and to our churches*, as much as they ever did to any. And *by consequence*, (mark the consequence, reader!) *that it is both our duty and interest* TO GO TO OUR RESPECTIVE CHURCHES, AS THE TWO GREAT APOSTLES DID TO THE TEMPLE, AT THE HOUR OF PRAYER." Little did the apostles or their historian suspect, that their example on this occasion, in visiting the temple at the hour of prayer, would be thus *turned to account* by one of the priests of the temple of mammon. It would appear, indeed, about as probable, that it is recorded of the apostles, that they broke bread—*on purpose* to set us the example of eating Welsh rabbits. The writer in the course of the last year, heard the same text turned to *another* account at Whitfield's conventicle in the City Road.—"In a regular attendance, (said the preacher) "on the house of God as the house of prayer, the two apostles have here set us the example. It is our duty so to arrange our time, as that we should be present, *not only at sermon time, but at the beginning of the services in those places in which prayer is wont to be made.*" We must conclude, therefore, that the apostles visit to the temple at the hour of prayer, was ON PURPOSE to quicken the motions of the saints in the City Road, as well as of the sinners in the diocese of St Asaph, impelling the one set to sleep in the cathedral, and the other to sigh in the conventicle! Truly, if these representations were correct (to say nothing of their inconsistency with each other), the apostles would have enough to answer for.

"turned without delay to Jerusalem, and were *continually* "*in the temple praising and blessing God.*"—"This was at "least (he argues) *public* devotion, and no doubt *social* also, "for such was the stated worship of this 'house of prayer,' "and they had no other, as yet, in which to assemble for "the purpose." Did the disciples then, we ask, return from being spectators of the ascension of their venerated master, to join in a set form of prayer, with perhaps the very individuals who had embrued their hands in that master's blood? We have seen that the Jews had at that time no set form of prayer; but if they had had such, would it not have been probable, almost certain, that they would have prayed for their still expected Messiah? Could the disciples have joined them in *this* prayer? Looking at the Jews as they then were, and the manner in which they had corrupted the truth (on the subject of prayer no less than on other subjects), is it likely that the apostles of Jesus could have joined with them in *social* prayer? Does not the assumption destroy itself? Is it not evident, that if they were in the temple, "praising and blessing God," or if they went there "*at the hour of prayer,*" that their devotions must have been separate and individual, and not socially with those who had destroyed their master, if even the Jewish nation had practised social prayer?*

We have now gone over most of the cases in which the prayers of individuals who were Jews, are spoken of as being offered up at the time of sacrifice; and we appeal to the reader, whether they do not, as far as they are applicable to the case, support all the positions which we have laid down, and destroy all the positions which we are controverting. In the first place, it will be observed, that the greater number of these are cases of persons praying, not in the temple or its courts, but at a distance from it; clearly shewing, that the temple was considered as a house of prayer, because it was the residence of God, not because it was a place of social prayer. It was, indeed, a "*tabernacle of* "*meeting;*" but it was a meeting between man and his Maker; not between man and his fellow creature; and even in these cases of prayer which were offered up in the courts

* To get rid of this difficulty it will be said, and is generally supposed, that the first converts went to the temple to pray socially *among themselves*. The reader, however, will remark the absurdity of the supposition, that two such congregations as the Jews and Christians met together, at the *same time* and *place*, publicly to *pray down* each other!

of the temple, we have found no cause whatever to believe, that it was social; but, on the contrary, every reason to infer, that it was individual.

A few striking and important cases of the temple prayer, yet remain to be referred to; but we shall first notice in this connection, certain circumstances connected with the erection and opening of the second temple, as recorded in the books of Ezra and Nehemiah. We notice them the rather because they are, at least some of them, frequently adduced in support of the practice of public social prayer, and because some degree of difficulty really attaches to them; but we are convinced, on a fair review, that that difficulty will cease; and that in the second, as in the first temple, there is no evidence whatever for believing that the Jewish people practiced the observance in question. As it did not exist in the first building, we are, indeed, justified in supposing, that it was not observed in the second. Where is the command that it should be added? In what passage of the books which bear their names, do we find Ezra or Nehemiah *adding* to those rites and ceremonies which had been instituted by Moses, or appointed by Solomon? It is for the defenders of social prayer to produce such: neither can we in such a case as this be content with indirect or incidental evidence; we are justified in looking for an express command, and a clear and explicit appointment, by Divine authority, of that rite or ceremony, (public social prayer) in the latter temple, which, we think, may fairly be said to have been *proved* not to have existed in the former one.

As, however, in the absence of such direct authority, incidental passages in these books *are* alluded to, and even much insisted on, we shall, in order to leave nothing undone within our power to establish the truth, advert to such, and endeavour to shew their true meaning, and fair interpretation. The seventh chapter of Nehemiah describes in detail, the number who returned from the captivity, with their several officers; here were, (besides the people) the priests, the levites, the porters, the singers, and the nethenims, (the hewers of wood and the drawers of water.) These it will be seen, were officers of the old temple, whose several employments we have already seen described; here was no *new* officer appointed for the *new* office of social prayer; neither was that employment added to the duties of any of the original attendants in the court of Jehovah. If, as Mr. Moore allows, there was in the first temple no officer to "conduct the devotions of the people," their devotions

must have remained equally without a conductor in the second.

The foundation of the new temple is described in Ezra, chap. iii. and its dedication is recorded in chap. vi. Both events were celebrated by religious observances—doubtless, it will be said, by *social* prayer—assuredly not! "*When* "*the foundation was laid, they set the priests in their apparel* "*with trumpets, and the levites, the sons of Asaph, with cym-* "*bals, to praise the Lord,* AFTER THE ORDINANCE OF "DAVID, KING OF ISRAEL." The dedication of "*this* "*house of God was kept with joy*"—but *social* prayer was not among the public forms then adopted as a demonstration of joy: it was by sacrifice that they expressed their exultation. —"*They offered an hundred bullocks, two hundred rams,* "*four hundred lambs; and for a sin offering for all Israel,* "*twelve he-goats.*" (Ezra vi. 17.) "*And they set the priests* "*in their divisions, and the levites in their courses, for the ser-* "*vice of God, which is at Jerusalem,* AS IT IS WRITTEN IN "THE BOOK OF MOSES." But amongst "THE ORDI- "NANCES OF DAVID," or "IN THE BOOKS OF MOSES," public social prayer was no where to be found! The companions of Ezra who afterwards return, also publicly celebrate their deliverance—and by what means?—by public social prayer?—No! They "*offered burnt offerings unto the* "*God of Israel; twelve bullocks for all Israel, ninety and six* "*rams, seventy and seven lambs, twelve he-goats, for a sin* "*offering: all this was a burnt offering unto the Lord;*" but of public social prayer unto the Lord, which if practised at all, would most have been practised on such an occasion, not one word is said.

A view of the peculiar circumstances in which the Jewish people were at this time placed, will explain much that is peculiar or extraordinary in their conduct. Theirs was a disorganized state of society: they cast lots to determine who shall dwell in Jerusalem, and who in the other cities, (Neh. xi. 1.) They assembled with fasting, and with sackcloth and earth upon them, and stood up and read the law, and confessed their sins; and worshipped or shewed reverence to the Lord their God; (ix. 3.) they renewed the national covenant with Jehovah, writing it, and putting to it the seal of the princes, levites, and priests; (x. 38.) When, whilst the whole people were plunged in want and misery, Nehemiah expressed his indignation (chap. v.) at those who exacted usury from their brethren, and, in the assembly of the people, shook his lap, and said, "*So God shake out every man*

"*from his house, that performeth not this promise,*" all the congregation signified their assent by saying, *Amen;* and, it is added, that they "*praised the Lord.*" Not in set forms of social prayer; but, as will be seen hereafter, in conformity with the manner of the people, by shouts and acclamations, or by repeating some of their peculiar, we may say, proverbial forms of expression, expressive of the greatness of their God and king. Thus also, when Ezra brought the long forgotten book of the law, and read and expounded it to the people, they received it with every demonstration of feeling and delight; and when Ezra blessed the Lord, the great God, all the people answered (not *amen* merely, in the formal use of the word as now used), but they expressed their assent and their gratitude, by shouting *amen, amen, with lifting up their hands.* These were, in fact, the acclamations of a multitude assembled, as it were, at a political meeting, for a purpose connected with their law;* and they bowed their hands and worshipped (shewed reverence to) the Lord, with their faces to the ground; and then, when these transports of their gratitude had subsided, the levites read in the book distinctly, and gave the sense, and caused them to understand the reading. Are we in our days, to *imitate* the conduct of this people upon this extraordinary occasion? It is argued, that we *are* to do so, and that we are regularly to practise social prayer, *because* they shouted assent (*amen, amen*) when they agreed with the sentiments of one of their leaders, and bowed their head, and shewed reverence when the law of their God and King was read to them. But if we are to imitate them, let us really do so, and not perform one thing because they did another. If we are to shout amen like them, let it be accompanied with lifting up of our hands, and with bowing with our faces to the ground. When they heard the law, all the people wept. (Neh. viii. 9.) When the foundation of the temple was laid, then too there were those (Ezra iii. 12) who "*wept with a loud voice;*" whilst there were others who "*shouted with a great shout; so that the people could "not discern the noise of the shouts of joy from the noise of "the weeping of the people.*" Now these are both cases adduced in support of social prayer: surely it would be re-

* The use of the phrase, *true, true,* in the public meetings of the English, and of *supported, supported,* by the French, would appear, particularly the latter, the nearest to approach to that use of the phrase *amen* by the Jews to which we are now adverting.

garded as an inroad on the modern practice, if the people (in the interior either of St. Paul's cathedral, or the chapel in South Place, Finsbury) were in the midst of the *service*, as it is called, to "*shout with a loud shout, and the noise* "*was heard afar off.*" Yet, if the Jews *are* to be our pattern in this respect, and if we are to do that regularly and stated which they did on these especial occasions, why should we not have weekly weepings and social shoutings? Why should we not lift up our hands and fall on our faces, as a matter of stated observance? for, for all these we have the example of the Jewish people at the time of the erection of the second temple.

Having thus noticed the erection and dedication of the second temple, we must, previous to leaving this part of the subject, notice one or two passages in the *New* Testament (in addition to those already cited) which shew the mode in which prayer was therein offered in the time of Jesus and his apostles. We have already, in adverting to the case of Zacharias, taken occasion to observe, that the early chapters of Luke, though evidently forged and spurious, yet, doubtless, contain correct representations as to the *manners* of the times, and the course of public events. These chapters speak of Annah, as an aged widow, who "*departed not* "*from the temple, but served God with fasting and* PRAYER, "*NIGHT AND DAY.*" In the authentic part of the same book, (xxiv. 53) it is recorded of the disciples, that they "*were* CONTINUALLY *in the temple, praising and blessing* "*God.*" Now the expressions *night and day* and *continually*, would appear to imply something more than attendance on regular and stated times of social prayer. As the cases are not spoken of as extraordinary, it was probably by no means uncommon amongst the Jews, that persons of greater piety than others, should, more frequently than others were, be in the temple; some, perhaps, even day and night; and some so often as to justify the term continually; and these persons must have been employed, not in *social* prayer, but in *individual* prayer, in some of the courts or chambers of the temple; many such being provided above the piazzas or porches above referred to, and which it has been surmised, with great probability, were used for this as well as other purposes. In such a chamber, it has been by some supposed, the events recorded in Acts ii. on the day of Pentecost, took place: to such a chamber it probably was, that Peter and John went up at the hour of prayer; (Acts iii. 1)

and that the apostles, instead of joining in prayer with the Jews, went *continually*, praising and blessing God. When the apostle Paul declares, (Acts xxii. 17) that whilst he prayed in the temple, "*he was in a trance*," and that miraculous communications were made to him, is it meant to be asserted, that this took place whilst he was joining in *social* prayer with the whole congregation of the people? Will Mr. Moore, or any other defender of the practice, have the hardihood to assert this? or, if they will not, how otherwise can they explain the fact? Upon our hypothesis, confirmed as we have shewn that hypothesis to be, by the general tenor of scripture, it is intelligible enough. Upon theirs it is grossly absurd, or perfectly unintelligible.

One other passage in the New Testament, as to the temple worship, and we shall leave this part of the subject as complete, and our point fully established. Mr. Moore, in his Inquiry, to which we have so frequently had occasion to refer, has devoted one whole section of that work, to "*the religious services of the temple* IN THE TIME OF "CHRIST." In his effort to prove, that public *social* prayer formed a part of these services, he has pressed into the service (how unsuccessfully has been seen in our preceding pages) the aid and authority of Lightfoot and Prideaux, Lewis and Miller, Leland and Godwin, Selden, Buxtorf, and Vitringa; to these have been added, the stores of rabbinical learning and traditionary lore, amongst the Jews themselves, from the Talmud and the glosses on the Talmud, (see p. 52) down to Maimonides; and thence from Maimonides down to Gam. Ben Pedahzur. Now to say nothing further than we have already said upon this long string of learned authorities, we would beg to offer (as we are specifically upon *the temple service* IN THE TIME OF CHRIST) *one* authority which appears to have wholly escaped the attention of Mr. Moore—we mean that of *Jesus* himself. How does the great teacher of all truth, when drawing a picture of the living manners of his times, in what manner does *he* describe the prayer of the temple, or (if it must so be termed) "the temple service?" Let his language speak for itself:—
"*Two men went up into the temple to pray; the one a pharisee,*
"*and the other a publican. The Pharisee stood and prayed*
"*thus* WITH HIMSELF: *God, I thank thee that I am not as*
"*other men are, extortioners, unjust, adulterers, or even as this*
"*publican: I fast twice in the week, I give tithes of all that I*
"*possess. And the publican* STANDING AFAR OFF, *would not*

"*lift up so much as his eyes unto heaven, but smote upon his* "*breast, saying, God be merciful to me a sinner.*"* What! two men praying, and one standing *with*, or by *himself*, and *one afar off!* One vaunting forth the boastings of pride, and another breathing the language of humility! One noticing in terms of implied censure, the man who was praying at the same time with him, and the other only appealing to God, and disregarding all else around him! Impossible! Surely it will be said—this cannot have been; for this is wholly inconsistent with the practice of *public social* prayer. Take for example, our churches and our chapels, and say if it be possible in either of them, that the pharisee and the publican could have prayed, as they are described by Jesus to have prayed. Let us take the established *church*, in which social prayer will be most completely found, and at the beginning of the service the *WHOLE congregation* address God, as "*their Almighty and most* "*merciful Father*," in the following terms of humility and confession: "We have erred and strayed from thy ways "like lost sheep: we have followed too much the devices "and desires of our own hearts. We have" (unlike the arrogant claims of the pharisee) "left undone those things "which we ought to have done, and we have done those "things which we ought not to have done; and there is "no health in us: but thou, O Lord, have mercy upon us "miserable offenders!" Now this is language, the prayer being *social*, which *ALL* must use: there is, there can be, *here* no distinction between the pharisees and the publicans in the congregation. The prayer of the temple, therefore, we directly infer, must have been somewhat different from this: it could not have been by a set form or liturgy, as in our establishment; but was it like the prayers of our dissenters, in which the priests lead the

* Should it be said, that this being a parable or fable, the whole is a fiction, we would reply, that although the *facts* described are fictitious, yet that, as being a picture of manners, addressed to the Jewish people, the whole is, no doubt, in strict accordance with their habits and practices. Jesus, indeed, in addition to the other inimitable beauties of his parables, was ever remarkable for the truth and correctness with which he poutrayed scenes from life. As his object when giving the parable above quoted, was to convey—not to us, in a distant age and country, but to the Jews, whom he addressed, a moral lesson as to the nature of prayer, there can be no doubt but that he correctly described, or rather alluded to, the *mode* of prayer then prevalent: without this his moral would have passed unheeded, and his whole intention have been defeated.

prayers of the people, speaking in their persons, and on their parts? Let us examine.—"We acknowledge thee, "(was the language, in prayer, some time since, of one of "the most eminent of the Unitarian teachers, Mr. Aspland) "we acknowledge thee to be the only high and true God; "besides whom there is no Saviour, and with whom there "is no equal. Instructed by thy word, we worship "and praise thee, the universal Father, with whom there "is no respect of persons. Holy Father, we *(that is, the "WHOLE congregation)* confess before thee our unworthi- "ness, and beseech thee, that we may be enabled to bring "forth the works of righteousness." Had there been proud pharisees in our days, and if it had not fortunately happened, that Mr. Aspland had none but humble and repentant sinners in his congregation, who felt and confessed their unworthiness before God, how could the pharisee in *his* congregation; in *his* mode of conducting social prayer, have stood *with himself* apart, and given expression to his spiritual pride and self-righteousness? It is evident then from these cases, that the prayer of the temple in the time of Jesus, *was conducted in a manner wholly different from the prayer, either of St. Paul's or of the Gravel-pits, Hackney.* It was, as has been evident throughout, and as is confirmed by this parable, *individual* prayer; each by himself offering his petition, as each knew the plague, or felt the pride of his own heart, and having neither priest to conduct their devotions, nor liturgies and prescribed forms to confine them within fixed modes of expression.

We have now examined the worship of the Jewish temple, from the time of its institution to that of Jesus and his apostles, as that worship is described in the authentic records of the Old and New Testament. From the whole it has appeared, that there is no foundation for the assertion, that public social prayer formed part of the service of that temple. We have seen, that it was never commanded, that it was never practised, and that no censures are ever levelled against either its neglect or its abuse. That the duty of the priests was sacrifice; that the office of the levites was singing praises in the presence of their God and King. That they were in neither of these joined by the people, who were kept separate and without, in the courts of the temple appropriated to them. That the Jewish people were *allowed* as a privilege, not commanded as a duty, or as part of the ordained worship

of the temple, *in* or *toward* this temple, as the palace of their king, and as containing the peculiar presence of their God, to offer up their petitions; that as each was to pray according as he knew the plague of his own heart, so each prayed separately, in language applicable to his own case and feelings. That the prayer of the Jews when absent, was *toward* the house, evidently shewing, that publicity and jointness were *not* the objects in view. That those who prayed *in* the courts of the temple, prayed there at any time, and at all times, as they pleased; but that a practice prevailed amongst the Jews, probably coeval with the building itself, of particularly offering up their petitions at stated hours, because as in the temple God was supposed to be peculiarly present, so at the time of sacrifice he was supposed to be peculiarly propitious. From the whole, we draw the general inference, that the Jews did *not* practice social prayer. Even had they done so, indeed, it would to *us* have been no matter of example; but not doing so, its advocates must look for other and better authority for the practice. We shall return to the subject, and discuss further the arguments adduced in defence of this ordinance.

THE LIGHT OF REVELATION AND THE LIGHT OF NATURE COMPARED.

A BELIEF in God, his providence, and a future state, are the fundamentals of religion. Men, whether they believe in revelation or not, must build upon the foundation which these supply. A belief in God is but a bare admission of superior power: if the government, *i. e.* the providence of God be added, yet, without a future state of righteous retribution, any moral system of belief is essentially imperfect. Vice is frequently triumphant—virtue often oppressed—but a future state opens and justifies the ways of God to man, and unites the religious and moral universe into a wise, comprehensive, and benevolent whole.

The opponents of revealed religion assert that the light of nature is sufficient to teach the existence and attributes of God—man's duty, and his future hopes. Believers deny this, and we purpose directing the reader's attention to the

question. But let the sufficiency of this natural light be conceded for the moment; let it be admitted that it teaches one only God, his providence, and a future state—Revelation *also* declares these great and important truths; the lessons of the one confirm the inferences from the other; all, therefore, that, in this respect, can be urged against revelation is—that it teaches that which may be inferred from the infinitely various works of God in creation.

Revelation and the works of nature proceed from the same source;—the God of truth—the benevolent creator of all things: their end is the same—the well being and happiness of man. Revelation declares that God is love; that love to God and our neighbour (piety and benevolence) comprehend the whole of our duties. This is the grand result of God's communications in the scriptures. "*Upon* "*these,*" to use the language of Jesus. "*hang all the law and* "*the prophets;*" and having thus simplified our duties in this life, we are further assured that we shall inherit eternal life, if, knowing these things, we do them. The pupil of nature declares that this also is the teaching of nature;* yet, he adds, revelation is false. He cannot intend that these principles are not true; granting, therefore, for the moment, that these principles might have been inferred from nature, all that can be urged against the teaching of Jesus is—that he taught that which may be inferred from other sources.

Believers in revealed religion, however, deny that the existence and attributes of the Supreme have ever been discovered by any nation, unaided by revelation, or by known intercourse with those who have enjoyed its advantages. That to revelation, and to that alone, are the views we now have of the unity, supremacy, benevolence, and providence of God to be referred.

---

* The following are the five articles put forth by Lord Herbert, of Cherbury, as the result of the teaching of the Book of Nature:—

I. That there is one supreme God of Gods and Father of all things.

II. That all worship and adoration ought to terminate in this one God.

III. That the love and pursuit of truth and virtue, is the chief and only essential part of this acceptable, rewardable worship of the one true God.

IV. That deep contrition and sorrow for our sins, and aberrations from truth and virtue, with a sincere repentance and reformatian after such sins committed, is the true propitiation for sin, or means of reconciling sinners to God.

V. That God, as the wise and righteous governor of the world, will certainly reward virtue, and punish vice, both here and hereafter.

Of these articles it may be safely asserted that they are all derived from the *New Testament*.

It may be asked of what importance is it from whence this knowledge is derived, if the principles are believed?—much every way! The continuance of religious and moral knowledge depends on a constant reference to its source; if we turn from the source of light we turn into darkness, and time but increases its density. When a system of religion is built upon erroneous inferences—such inferences, though not morally bad in themselves, become fraught with the same mischiefs as if they were so. Error may be infinitely varied, in kind and degree; but if it exist in the premises, the conclusions cannot but be widely distant from truth, and the consequences will be as serious as the subject is important. We pass then to the inquiry into the source of religious and moral knowledge. Is it derived from revelation, or taught by the light of nature, without the aid of revelation?

What is man by nature? And lest we should be supposed to represent him as degraded, weak, and dependent, for the purposes of our argument, we will take the words of an opponent of revelation—not solely because they suit the intent of our argument—but because we think they truly represent the situation of man in a state of nature. "Man, (says Volney) in a "savage state, is a brute; an ignorant animal; a mischevious "and ferocious beast, like a bear, or an ourang outang; he is "not happy in such a state, for he has but the sensations "of the moment, and these sensations are habitually senti-"ments of violent and pressing wants, which he cannot "gratify; seeing that he is ignorant by nature, and feeble "by his state of insulation from society." This, we say, is substantially a correct view of man in a state of nature, and justly exhibits his intellectual and physical wants. It is evident that the course of nature, by which the physical man is *now* nurtured into being, must have been departed from in the instance of the *first* man. The constitution of nature bespeaks a wise and benevolent author; and that adaptation of the passions and affections, to which we owe our support in infancy—our nurture into maturity, *must* have been supplied by other benevolent means to our first parents. Surely the intellectual wants of the being were as pressing and as important as the physical necessities of the animal. God had endowed man with powers superior to those of all other sensitive beings; and as his intellectual is superior to his physical powers, the inference in favour of a moral revelation is as strong as the necessity for a physical superintendence is obvious. It may be urged that the

physical wants being supplied, man would ultimately have arrived at a knowledge of his Creator, and have worshipped him in spirit and in truth. We shall shew that, unaided by revelation, he never has done this; that with it he has risen superior in the moral scale to those who have not known God through its medium. For the present let us hear what is said of the light of nature, and its sufficiency for the moral and intellectual necessities of humanity, by one of its advocates.

"The word of God (says Mr. Paine*) is the creation we behold. And it is in this word, which no human invention can counterfeit or alter, that God speaketh universally to man. It is only in the creation that all our ideas and conceptions of a word of God can unite. The creation speaketh an universal language, independently of human speech, or human language, multiplied and various as they be. It is an ever-existing original, which every man can read. It cannot be forged; it cannot be counterfeited; it cannot be lost; it cannot be altered; it cannot be suppressed. It does not depend upon the will of man whether it shall be published or not: it publishes itself from one end of the earth to another. It preaches to all nations, and to all worlds; and this word of God reveals to man all that is necessary for man to know of God.

These are the assertions of the advocates of the sufficiency of the light of nature. The advocates of revelation have a right to expect evidence in support of the system of their opponents. A rational deist will admit that assertion is not proof, and we ask him to put this question to himself—What evidence ought to be adduced in support of this statement? He surely will not say that those nations who have professed to guide themselves by the light of revelation, are proofs of the sufficiency of the light of Nature, unaided by revelation. The only mode of establishing the sufficiency of the light of nature is to refer to those nations who have *not* possessed the light of revelation. If the Book of Creation (to use the language of Mr. Paine) speaketh an universal language, if it be "an ever existing "original, which every man can read," if it "publishes "itself from one end of the earth to the other," if "it "teaches to all nations all that is necessary for man to "know of God," some one of the multitude of nations, of which history furnishes the knowledge, can be referred to in proof of the assertion—the affirmative is upon those who assert the fact; and when it is said that "the belief of a "God is, of all beliefs, the most easy, because it arises out

* Age of Reason.

"of necessity,"* the friends of revelation may surely ask for a solitary instance of the fact. They can, however, go far to prove the negative of the assertion, from the intentional admissions of some, and the unintentional admissions of others, from the records of history, and from the knowledge which those who have had intercourse with the nations of recently discovered countries, have aquired and made known. We beg our readers to attend to the language of Mr. Paine before quoted, and to compare their assertions with the following extracts from the reasoning of Mr. Hume, another enemy to revelation, in proof of the proposition—that polytheism, not the belief in one God, was the primary religion of man.

"It appears to me,† that if we consider the improvement of human society, from rude beginnings to a state of greater perfection, polytheism, or idolatry, was, and necessarily must have been, the first and most ancient religion of mankind. This opinion I shall endeavour to confirm by the following arguments:—

"It is a matter of fact incontestable that, about 1700 years ago, all mankind were polytheists; the doubtful and sceptical principles of a few philosophers, or the theism, and that too not entirely pure, of one or two nations, form no objection worth regarding. Behold then the clear testimony of history. The farther we mount up into antiquity, the more do we find mankind plunged into polytheism—no marks, no symptoms of any more perfect religion. The most ancient records of human race still presents us with that system, as the popular and established creed. The north, the south, the east, the west, give their unanimous testimony to the same fact. What can be opposed to so full an evidence? As far as writing or history reaches, mankind, in ancient times, appear universally to have been polytheists. Shall we assert, that in more ancient times, before the knowledge of letters, or the discovery of any art or science, man entertained the principles of pure theism. That is, while they were ignorant and barbarous, they discovered truth, but fell into error, as soon as they acquired learning and politeness. But, in this assertion, you not only contradict all appearance of probability, but also our present experience concerning the principles and opinions of barbarous nations: the savage tribes of America, Africa, and Asia, are all idolaters.

"It seems certain that, according to the progress of human thought, the ignorant multitude must first entertain some grovelling and familiar notion of superior powers, before they stretch their conception to that perfect Being, who bestowed order on the whole frame of nature. We may as reasonably imagine that men inhabited palaces before huts and cottages, or studied geometry before agriculture, as assert that the Deity appeared to them a pure spirit, omniscient, omnipotent, and omnipresent, before he was apprehended to be a powerful, though limited being, with human passions and appetites, limbs and organs. The mind rises gradually from inferior to superior; by abstracting from what is imperfect, it forms an idea of perfection; and slowly distinguishing the nobler parts of its own frame from the grosser, it learns to transfer only the former, much elevated and refined, to

* Age of Reason.

† The Natural History of Religion.

its divinity. Nothing could disturb this natural progress of thought, but some obvious and invincible argument, which might immediately lead the mind into the pure principles of theism, and make it overleap, at one bound, the vast interval which is interposed between the human and divine nature. But though I allow that the order and frame of the universe, when acurately examined, affords such an argument, yet I can never think that this consideration could have an influence on mankind when they formed their first rude notions of religion. The causes of such objects as are quite familiar to us, never strike our attention or curiosity; and, however extraordinary or surprising these objects in themselves, they are passed over by the raw and ignorant multitude, without much examination or inquiry. Adam rising at once, in Paradise, and in the full perfection of his faculties, would naturally, as represented by Milton, be astonished at the glorious appearances of nature, the heavens, the air, the earth, his own organs and members, and would be led to ask—whence this wonderful scene arose? But a barbarous, necessitous animal, (such as man is on the first origin of society) pressed by such numerous wants and passions, has no leisure to admire the regular face of nature, or make inquiries concerning the cause of those objects, to which, from his infancy, he has been gradually accustomed. On the contrary, the more regular and uniform, that is, the more perfect nature appears, the more he is familiarized to it, and the less inclined to scrutinize and examine it; a monstrous birth excites his curiosity, and is deemed a prodigy; it alarms him from its novelty, and immediately sets him a trembling, and sacrifising and praying; but an animal, complete in all its limbs and organs, is to him an ordinary spectacle, and produces no religious opinion or affection. Ask him whence that animal arose, he will tell you from the copulation of its parents, and these, whence, from the copulation of theirs. A few removes satisfy his curiosity, and set the objects at such a distance, that he entirely loses sight of them. Imagine not that he will so much as start the question —whence the first animal, much less whence the whole system or united fabric of the universe arose. Or, if you start such a question to him, expect not that he will employ his mind with any anxiety about a subject so remote, so uninteresting, and which so much exceeds the bounds of his capacity."

The religion of nature is nothing more than the inferences or conclusions which each individual man draws from the works of God, as to his being and attributes; the clown draws few, if any; the philosopher many, and various; and the religion is as infinitely varied as the combinations of thought, and the deductions of the myriads, to whom the power of thought is given. Authority is out of the question; there can be no common standard. The "Book "of Creation," it is true, is *open* to all; but no one nation can be named to which it has taught all that is necessary for man to know. Surely there is a sad deficiency in the evidence which is to prove the sufficiency of this religion. It publishes itself, say its advocates, from one end of the earth to the other; and the evidence adduced is, we presume, to be brought from the followers of Mahomet, the disciples of Zoroaster, the various Indian sects, the Tartar hordes, the African savages, the American Indians, the

recently discovered Esquimaux, and the multitude of worshippers of birds, beasts, insects, and idols, or from the pagan mythologists.

Let us see from Mr. Volney what has been, and is, in fact, the teaching of this universal religion, which communicates all that is necessary for man to know. He has condensed the history of the religion of all nations, in his Ruins of Empires; and the opponent of revelation cannot object his partiality for revelation against the authority of his testimony.

"Behind them came the less magnificent standards of a multitude of Gods, male, female, and hermaphrodite, related to, and connected with, the three principal, who pass their lives in intestine war, and are, in this respect, imitated by their worshippers. These Gods have need of nothing, and receive offerings without ceasing. Their attributes are omnipotence and ubiquity; and a Bramin, with some petty charm, imprisons them in an image, or in a pitcher, and retails their favours according to his will and pleasure.

"As these standards passed, an innumerable crowd of others presented themselves to our eyes, and the genius exclaimed—I should never come to a conclusion, were I to detail to you all the different systems of belief which divide these nations. Here the Tartar hordes adore—under the figure of animals, insects, and birds—the good and evil Genii; who, under a principal but indolent divinity, govern the universe by their idolatry, giving us an image of the ancient paganism of the western world. You see the strange dress of the Chamans—a robe of leather, fringed with little bells and rattles, embroidered with idols of iron, claws of birds, skins of serpents, and heads of owls; they are agitated with artificial convulsions, and with magical cries invoke the dead to deceive the living. In this place you behold the sooty inhabitants of Africa, who, while they worship their *Fetiches*, entertain the same opinions. The inhabitant of Juida adores God under the figure of an enormous serpent, which, for their misfortune, the swine reward as a delicious morsal. The Teleutean dresses the figure of his God in a variety of gaudy colours, like a Russian soldier. And the Kamchadale, finding that every thing goes on ill in this world, and under his climate, represents God to himself under the figure of an ill-natured and arbitrary old man, smoking his pipe, and sitting in his traineau, employed in the hunting of foxes and martins. In fine, there are a hundred other savage nations, who, entertaining none of these ideas of civilized countries respecting God, the soul, and a future state, exercise no species of worship, and yet *are not less favoured with the gifts of nature, in the* IRRELIGION *to which nature has destined them.*"

Thus then—upon the shewing of the advocates of the Book of Nature—polytheism, idolatry, and irreligion, have been the results of its teachings; whilst, as we shall evidence in our next, Revelation alone has exhibited to the world correct conceptions of the character and requirements of the Invisible Creator.

A CHARACTER.

After the manner of a Living Author.

Mr. ——— is one of those elderly gentlemen who continually think, and talk, and write of the days of their youth only; who see nothing to admire in the present, and nothing to hope for in the future; to whom the *past* is every thing—all and in all. Whatever has gone by he can recount with the most minute accuracy; particularly all that is *unimportant* in the past. His eye is a telescope, which magnifies small objects, and only sees distant ones. Like Jack the Giant Killer, after he had sown the beans, his whole time is employed in tracing back his steps to the point at which he set out. Life is a verb which he conjugates in the *preterite* tense only. It is a false perspective, like Hogarth's picture, in which the most distant objects are the largest. If he should run a race for a wager, it would be like that of the man recently spoken of in the newspapers, who ran farther than any one had ever done before him—*backwards!* He goes the journey of this world in a coach, with his back always to the horses. Of all the fishes in the sea, he is, in this respect, the most like the crab; of all the beasts on the earth, the most like the cat, for he can see best in the dark, and the pupil of his eye contracts at the sunshine, resting on present objects. He has kept a diary of his life, and every morning turns back and folds down the leaf at fifty years ago. He can tell you how he ate, and drank, and slept, during the greater part of the last century; and run a regular parallel between the present times and seventeen hundred and odd.

As he is a professor of religion—a dissenter—and an *enlightened* dissenter—he can give the most minute account of the origin and progress of his party. He is himself, in this respect, a whole antiquarian society—president, members, secretary and all. He knows when the Rev. Mr. ——— (who died twenty years ago, and was forgotten long before he died) preached his first sermon, what was his text, and under how many heads he divided his discourse. He can write whole pages of the actions of a man who did nothing, and delights in *reminiscences* of those of whom nothing deserves to be remembered.

> "O fond attempt to give a deathless lot
> To names ignoble—born to be forgot."

To a line of text in large he can add whole pages of com-

ment in little, remembering all the men who all the world besides has forgotten, and giving a *catalogue raisonnée* of such of their works as have been neglected by posterity, and used up as waste paper. He *amuses* a convivial party by discourses on their departed friends; his whole conversation is a *prose* version of the Pleasures of Mémory; and the best introduction he can give to an acquaintance is to tell in which volume, and at what page, his great grandfather is spoken of in Wood's *Athenæ Oxonionsis*. He is, in fact, the tomb-stone of his party, or its parish register. His discourse is one long funeral oration. Futurity with him travels backward, toward the flood: his course is toward the beginning of things. He lives a third time in the race—not of his grand children—but of his grand father; and his life, spent in the contemplation of his *first* childhood, secures him from the imputation of ever entering on his *second*.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE TRINITY.

Lightfoot, in commenting upon some portions of the Old Testament, says—"Some three months after this, the three persons of the Trinity dine with "Abraham. The Son and Holy Ghost go down to Sodom, but the first "person of the Trinity stayeth with Abraham."

An "*Allegorical Picture of the Battle of Waterloo*," by *Ward*, was recently exhibited in London. In the description which was sold in the exhibition room, occurred the following explantion of "*The Union Jack*." —"Wellington has his hand upon the tri-coloured cross on the shield of "Britannia, expressive of the Christian's emblem; the three colours of "which it is composed, being answerable to the persons of the Trinity.

"*Red* is the first, or fiery principle in the Godhead.

"*Blue*, the second, is the Saviour or Mediator.

"*White*, the third, is the dove of peace."

In the "*Rules and Orders of the Christian Benefit Society, held at the "Vestry of Mr. Upton's Meeting, Church Street, Blackfriars Road, insti-"tuted January* 7, 1817," the first rule, being that relative to the qualification of membership, is as follows:—"That this society shall consist of "persons of sober life and conversation, well affected to his Majesty King "George the Third, and the Protestant interest; *partakers of divine grace and "holding evangelical sentiments, particularly the doctrine of the Trinity;* viz. "that there are three equal persons in the Trinity, the Father, the Son, "and the Holy Ghost, and that these three are one "God."

The priest is, *of course*, the president of this body; and he prefaces the rules with a *pious* address. A member of this benefit club, who has abjured the doctrine of the Trinity, has not long since become a member of the Freethinking Christians Church. He has, in consequence, been expelled the club, and all his previous contributions FORFEITED—the "partakers of "divine grace," and the holders of evangelical sentiments," not objecting thus to *hold* and *partake* of the money of an heretic.

NOTICES.

THE following Subjects are appointed by the Church of God, denominated Freethinking Christians, for the instruction of the Public on the Sunday Mornings, at their Meeting-house, Crescent, Jewin Street, Aldersgate Street.—Time of commencing Eleven o'Clock PRECISELY.

July 4.—The evidence upon which is founded a belief in the resurrection of Jesus, and also of the general resurrection.

July 11.—The effects, direct and indirect, of revealed religion upon the general condition of mankind.

July 18.—The character and claims of modern, assumed Believers.

July 25.—An examination and an exposure of the pretensions, the principles, and the characters of eminent unbelievers.

August 1.—The same subject continued.

August 8.—Ditto ditto.

August 15.—The Constitution, Government, and Laws of the Church of God, under the Christian dispensation.

August 22.—The character and attributes of God, as delineated in the Old and New Testaments, compared with the works of Nature.

August 29.—An examination of the maxims and principles contained in what is termed—the Sermon of Jesus upon the Mount.

Sept. 5.—What support does a belief in good angels and spirits, derive from the scriptures?

Sept. 12.—The character of Jesus.

Sept. 19.—The dispositions necessary to the possession of the advantages which the principles of Jesus are capable of producing.—Founded on Matthew xiii. 44 to 52.

Sept. 26.—The belief in the existence of a being called the Devil proved to be unreasonable and unscriptural.

Our friend C. T. certainly establishes his point, but we apprehend no one can be found who supposes the funeral service of the church of England has any authority in the scriptures.

If, as requested, we should offer our "*candid* remarks" on the publication of J. Carstairs, we should do him a great disservice.

Joseph John Gurney's book on the Peculiarities of the Society of Friends has been received, for which we are obliged to the author.

The Report of the Southwark Auxiliary Bible Society has been received from our Southwark Correspondent—such documents are always useful to us.

HETHERINGTON, PRINTER, 13, KINGSGATE STREET, HOLBORN.

THE

FREETHINKING

CHRISTIANS'

QUARTERLY REGISTER.

THE RESURRECTION FROM THE DEAD OPPOSED TO THE DOCTRINE OF THE IMMORTALITY OF THE SOUL.

ESSAY V.

"If the dead rise not, then is Christ not raised; and if Christ be not "raised, your faith is vain; ye are yet in your sins; THEN THEY ALSO "WHICH ARE FALLEN ASLEEP IN CHRIST ARE PERISHED." 1 Cor. xv. 17, 18, 19.

IN our first Essay upon this subject, which commenced in Volume I. p. 19, we proposed to establish the positions "that the resurrection from the dead is *peculiarly* the doctrine of the gospel, and that the hypothesis of an immaterial, immortal soul, is a "doctrine of heathenism and infidelity, and essentially opposed to the christian's hopes of futurity:" this design has been carried into effect, by historically tracing immaterialism up to an origin purely heathen;—by proving that man is entirely material, and that his physical and mental powers are produced by organization;—by explaining all the scriptural terms connected with this subject, and deducing therefrom direct evidence in disproof of immaterialism;—by examining every passage in both the Old and New Testament, which our opponents have advanced, and proving that such passages do not answer the object for which they are adduced—and by shewing, that from the period of death, to that of a resurrection, there is no recognition in the scriptures of an intermediate state of consciousness, and that, consequently, there is no evidence

that the future existence of man, his punishments and his rewards, will commence until the period of the resurrection.

Having effected thus much in the controversy, we now proceed briefly to notice the leading and important place which the doctrine of the resurrection from the dead occupies in divine revelation; and such being admitted, the doctrine of the materiality of man follows as an inseparable consequence, for as has been briefly and clearly stated, "death and resurrection are terms opposed to each other; "a real resurrection must be preceded by the actual death "of that which is raised; that which does not die, cannot "be raised *from* the dead; the resurrection made known "in the Scriptures is a resurrection from the dead; whatever "is to be raised from the dead, must remain dead, until "it is raised."* This view of future existence will be seen directly to emanate from the declarations of Jesus, as well as from the teachings of his apostles, it having been announced that "*this is the will of him that sent me, that every "one that seeth the son and believeth on him, may have everlast-"ing life, and I will raise him up at the last day,*" John vi. 40; and those who from right principles could give entertainment to others, are told to "*call the poor, the maimed, the "lame, the blind, and thou shalt be blessed, for they cannot recom-"pence thee—thou shalt be recompenced at the resurrection "of the just.*" Luke xiv. 13, 24. Thus, "the will of him" that sent the Messiah was to make known to his creatures, "everlasting life;" a life from the very terms of the communication, clearly not derivable from a self-existent, immortal principle, but, from the "resurrection from the "dead;" when all that are in their graves shall come forth to the resurrection of life, or to that of condemnation. It was for proclaiming this doctrine, and that too in defiance of both Jewish and Heathen authorities, and even of martyrdom itself, on the part of the apostles, that the "*priests and the "captains of the temple and the sadducees came upon them; being "grieved that they taught the people and preached through "Jesus*"—not the immortality of the soul, but—"*the RE-"SURRECTION FROM THE DEAD.*" (Acts iv. 1, 2.)

The hope of a future state of existence, built upon this foundation, rests not on the belief of an immortal spirit, but solely, and to the *exclusion* of all other doctrines, on the declarations of the Messiah, and the fact that God had raised the man Jesus from the dead; for "*if there be no resurrection*

* See "The Resurrection from the dead an essential Doctrine of the Gospel." By R. Wright, Unitarian Missionary.—P. 6. 1820.

"*of the dead,* (no future life) *then is Christ not risen; and if* "*Christ be not risen, then is our preaching vain, and your faith* "*is also vain, yea, and we are found false witnesses of God;* "*because we have testified of God that he raised up Christ;* "*whom he raised not up, if so be that the dead rise not.*" (1 Cor. xv. 14, 15, 16.) So that from the reasoning of Paul it is clear to demonstration, that if our future existence depend upon our being animated by an immaterial spirit, the apostle was not favoured with the knowledge of so convenient a passport to immortality, and was therefore deprived of a most easy and infallible mode of silencing all gainsayers; for of what avail to the argument in support of a future state of existence could be the resurrection of Jesus, providing the doctrine of immaterialism were true; as, in that case, whether he were raised from the dead, or whether he were not raised, immortality was alike ensured to *every* man, and that too, upon the shewing of our opponents, independent even of the power of God! but the apostle Paul, as if possessed of a foreknowledge of the perversions which the doctrine of a future state was destined to undergo, has put upon record such views upon this subject, as cannot fail to explode every fallacious theory: thus, the Thessalonians are told "*I would not have you to be* "*ignorant, brethren, concerning them which are asleep, that* "*ye sorrow not, as others which have no hope:* FOR IF "*WE BELIEVE THAT JESUS DIED AND ROSE AGAIN,* "*even so them also which sleep in Jesus will God bring* "*with him, wherefore comfort one another with these* "*words.*" (1 Thess. iv. 13, 14, 18.) Upon the supposition of all being animated by an immortal principle, how or why, we would ask, should the apostle, when expressly treating of a future state, and the hopes consequent upon its belief, have omitted all reference thereto? and, upon the same hypothesis, why should the Thessalonians "sorrow?"—why should they have "no hope?" for, whether Jesus had "risen again" or not, that fact could neither retard nor accelerate the future life of immortal souls—but in addition, this same apostle, concludes one division of his argument to the Corinthians, with a remark which for ever should put this question beyond all controversy; for, "*if Christ be not raised, your* "*faith is vain, you are yet in your sins; then they also* WHICH "*ARE FALLEN ASLEEP IN CHRIST, ARE PERISHED!!! If in* "*this life only we have hope in Christ, we are of all men most* "*miserable.*" (1. Cor. xv. 17, 18, 19.) Here we close with the immaterialist, and maintain that as an immortal soul

cannot perish, he must either renounce his system, or renounce Paul; for the latter unequivocally asserts, (and indeed his argument can have no weight, except upon its admission) the complete mortality of the entire man, who, when he has "fallen asleep," cannot have hopes of again existing, but by means of a resurrection from the dead; the evidence for which was made to rest, not upon an inherent immortality, but upon the fact that Jesus, a man like ourselves, had been raised from the dead: for, "*if there be no resurrection of the dead, then is Christ not* "*risen;*" and in the emphatic language of the apostle to the Jews—"*Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus* "*Christ, which according to his abundant mercy hath begotten* "*us again unto a lively hope* BY THE RESURRECTION OF "JESUS CHRIST *from the dead, to an inheritance incorruptible* "*and undefiled, and that fadeth not away, reserved in heaven* "*for you.*" (1 Peter, i. 3, 4.)

THE FORM AND MANNER OF THE RESURRECTION has long been a subject of considerable disputation; and the defenders of immaterialism have laboured to make their system accord with the scriptures, by asserting that the *same* identical flesh and blood from which the soul took its departure at death, will be again animated by the *same soul*, and thereby enjoy immortality,* although Paul has announced, that we "*shall be changed;*" "*that corrup-* "*tion cannot inherit incorruption,*" and that we shall be "*raised incorruptible.*" On the other hand, the enemies of revelation have not failed to avail themselves of this theory, and have well argued the difficulties with which it is attended: thus "the same piece of matter may happen to "be a part of two or more bodies, as a fish feeding on a "man, and another man afterwards feeding on the fish, "part of the body of the first man, becomes first incor-"porated with the fish, and afterwards in the fish with the "last man; instances have been known of one man feeding "upon another, and where the substance of one man is "thus converted into the substance of another, such cannot "rise with his whole body, and to which shall the part in "common belong?"†

* As an example of the mode of reasoning in support of this theory, we select a passage from Addison: "He triumphs in his agonies, whilst the soul springs forward to the great object which she has always had in view, and leaves the body with an expectation of being reunited to her in a glorious and joyful resurrection.—*Spectator.*

† See Rees's Cyclo. Vol. XXX.

Whatever force these objections may have, they are only applicable to those who maintain the resurrection of the *same body*, and will be found to fall perfectly harmless, when applied to the scriptural doctrine of a future life; for, as Locke has ably observed in his reply to the Bishop of Worcester, "In the New Testament, I find, our Saviour and the apostles "preach the resurrection *of the dead*, and the resurrection "*from the dead;* but I do not remember any place where "the resurrection of the *same body* is so much as mentioned; "nay, which is very remarkable in the case, I do not re-"member in any place of the New Testament, where the ge-"neral resurrection at the last day is spoken of, any such "expression as the resurrection of the body." In addition to the reasoning of Locke we would observe, that the *same* flesh and blood—*the same* particles of matter—cannot be raised in the same person, nor are they essential to constitute the *same man*. *Conscious identity* being the only criterion, by means of which the unity, or sameness of any given individual can be preserved; and that too even in the present life, (without at all referring to the decomposition which the dead body rapidly undergoes) for in the living person "the human body is continually changing; a man "has not entirely the same body to-day as he had yesterday; "and it is even computed, that in less than seven years "time, the whole human body undergoes a change, AND "NOT A PARTICLE OF THE SAME BODY REMAINS."*

A future life is, therefore, not a reanimation of the *same* particles of matter, but a revival of the consciousness of prior existence; and in such revived consciousness will consist the resurrection, or the re-living of mankind; and while upon this branch of our subject we would remark, that should the use of the term "resurrection," occasion any difficulty, it would be well in any such cases to substitute the words "future life" such being in every instance the sense in which it is used; a sense which, in the judgement of good critics, would be a more faithful rendering of the term in the original.

The *form* with which we shall rise from the dead, would seem of old, as well as in modern times, to have been urged as an objection to a future life; and in the instance of the unbelievers in the Corinthian church, Paul at once states and meets this supposed difficulty. "*But some man will say,* HOW *will the dead* "*be raised up, and with* WHAT BODY *do they come? Thou fool!*

---

* Rees's Cylo. Vol. XXX. article Resurrection.

"*that which thou sowest is not quickened, except it die, and* "*that which thou sowest, thou sowest not that body that shall* "*be, but bare grain; but God giveth it a body as it pleaseth* "*him, and to every seed its own body.*" (1 Cor, xv. 35 to 37.)

From this familiar illustration of the apostle, much misconception has arisen; chiefly, however, from a mistaken idea, that it was designed by him as a complete exposition of the doctrine of a future life; when, in fact, it is advanced, not for the purpose of proving the resurrection at all, but to answer an inquiry, "*with what body we should come*" when rising from the dead; which objection the writer treats with merited indifference, as being of no importance, seeing that God giveth to all parts of creation, whether animate or inanimate, "*whatsoever body it pleaseth him;*" and, to all, those bodies which are best suited to the purposes for which he had designed them: still one class of objectors, among whom Mr. Paine ranks pre-eminent, thinks fit thus to condemn the reasoning of the apostle: "Sometimes "Paul affects to be a naturalist, and to prove his sys-"tem of resurrection from the principles of vegitation, "but the metaphor, in this point of view, is no simile,—it is "succession not resurrection:—the progress of an animal "from one state of being to another, as from a worm to a "butterfly, applies to the case; but this of a grain does "not, and shews Paul to have been what he says of "others—a fool."* An attention, however, to the remarks of Paul would have shewn Mr. Paine, that it is not to "prove his system of resurrection" that he illustrates his idea by seed sown in the ground: that branch of his argument having been brought to a conclusion in the preceeding verses, in which he "proves his system," not from "affecting to be a naturalist," but from the admitted fact of the resurrection of the Messiah, and the promises consequent upon that event, and that, without at all going into the question, as to *how*, and in what manner the designs of God upon that subject should be carried into effect; though in fact, had Paul used the simile of the seed with the object stated by Mr. Paine, his reasoning would not have merited the comments which it has received; for as Dr. Priestley has remarked, "the comparison is not "to be supposed to apply throughout, as if the Apostle in-"tended to say, that by a law of nature, similar to that of "the re-production of seeds from seeds, a dead man should

* Age of Reason, Part II. p. 85. Carlile's 8vo. Edit. 1819.

"produce a living one, for the cases are remarkably dif-
"ferent, there being an apparent living principle or germ,
"the expansion of which makes the future plant; so that if
"the whole seed should ever become putrid, no other plant
"or seed could be produced from it; but as antecedent to
"experience, we could not have known this, but should
"rather have imagined, that a seed buried in the ground
"would be absolutely lost; so, notwithstanding appear-
"ances to the contrary, with respect to man, though he be
"buried, the time may come, when he will appear again."*

But had Paul's knowledge of natural history equalled that of *even* the author of the "Age of Reason," and had he attempted, as Mr. Paine states he might have done, to prove "his system of resurrection," by "the progress of "an animal from one state of being to another, as from a "worm to a butterfly," then indeed his reasoning might well have been impeached, for in the instance of seed sown in the earth, there *is* an apparent extinction of life; but in Mr. Paine's amended case, there is neither a real, nor an apparent extinction; for the worm, in becoming a butterfly, merely undergoes a change of form whilst in the full possession of life and vigour. Had the apostle thus argued the doctrine of the resurrection, and had he been so imbecile a reasoner as to "apply to his case," an instance, which if it proved any thing, would prove the negative of his own position; then, indeed, he might well have been arraigned for his folly. The simile used by Paul, it will be seen, was not to prove the resurrection, but simply to meet the question, as to our *form* in a future state; and he further proceeds, in support of his familiar illustration, to maintain, that "GOD GIVETH WHAT FORM IT PLEASETH HIM," as instanced in the evidence of Almighty power; that power, the magnitude and infinity of which was equally developed in the minute, as well as in the vast in creation; and in all there was an evidence of the *fitness* of every form *to* the circumstances, and *for* the purposes for which it was created, as demonstrated in the production of the fruits of the earth—in the formation of beasts—of birds —of fishes—of men—of bodies terrestial and celestial—in the glory of the sun—of the moon—of the stars—and, "*as "one star differeth from another star in glory, so also is the "resurrection of the dead: it is sown in corruption, it is raised "in incorruption; it is sown in weakness, it is raised in power;*

* Priestley's Notes on the Bible, Vol. IV. p. 160.

"*it is sown an animal body, it is raised a spiritual body;* "*for there is an animal* body, and there is a spiritual body.*" (41. 43.) Paul, (says Locke) means to shew, "that as we "now have animal bodies, which, unless supported by a "constant supply of food and air, will fail and perish, and "at last, do what we can, will dissolve, and come to an "end, so that at the resurrection we shall have bodies "which shall have an essential, natural, and inseparable life "in them;" that life, we would further remark, which is promised by Jesus to those "which shall be accounted "worthy to obtain that world, and the resurrection from the "dead; for neither can they die any more, for they are equal "to the angels, (messengers) and are the children of God, "being the children of the resurrection." (Luke xx. 35, 36.

Thus the argument pursued by Paul to convince those of the Corinthian church who were unbelievers in a future state, is of great importance; as we have seen, that, whilst he could have no conception of the theories of the immaterialists, yet, had his argument been expressly shaped for

---

* The received text reads, "*it is sown a* NATURAL *body,*" which tends to mislead the reader. Our adoption of the above rendering is supported by numerous authorities. See Macknight, Belsham, and Locke; the latter of whom states, that the term "translated in the Bible *a natural body,* should be translated *an animal body.*" And, in conformity with this view of the present and preceding passages, the late Mr. Alexander has thus ably paraphrased these verses:—"Shall we imagine that the Being who annually renews the face of Nature, and gives fresh life to the world of plants and vegetables, is either unwilling to exert himself in behalf of reasonable beings, or can find no resources in his power and wisdom, for restoring *men* to life, and furnishing them with such bodies as are adapted to a more perfect and durable state of existence? This will appear still more credible if we consider the immense variety which reigns throughout the works of Nature, and in what manner the Creator of all things has furnished the almost endless tribes of animals which inhabit this globe with a form and temperament peculiar to themselves, and at the same time exquisitely accommodated to their condition and ways of living. Man is sown and buried in the ground, but is raised incorruptible, without the least tendency to a decay; (he) is consigned to the ground in a state of dishonour, when the breath being departed, the dust returns to dust, and mingles with its native earth; but that which is raised appears with peculiar marks of honour and dignity; it (he) is sown in weakness, the fine machine being totally disordered, its action ceased, and the organs of sense no longer able to perform any part of their wonted service; but it (he) is raised with accessions of power and strength, and with an improved capacity of performing all the actions of a nobler life. An animal body is sown in the ground, and endued with the breath of life, but a life imperfect and momentary, subject to disease, sorrow, and travail; but a spiritual body is raised of a more refined and perfect constitution, and which is superior to all the pains and evils of mortality."—Paraphrase upon 15th Corinthians, by John Alexander, 1766, p. 58.

the purpose of overthrowing such doctrines, it could not have been more successful; and while the *certainty* of that state is maintained, some of the particulars which will be characteristic of it, are also treated upon for the evident purpose of giving a connected view of the entire subject; for "*now is Christ risen from the dead, and become the first* "*fruits of them that slept,*" verse 20; the first fruits in the Mosaic law, (Lev. xxiii. 10) being the first ripe corn gathered before the rest, such being the earnest and pledge of the future harvest; a figure, as applied to a future state of existence, illustrative of the situation occupied by Jesus, relatively towards others. "*But every man in his own order,* "*Christ, the first fruits, afterwards they that are Christ's, at his* "*coming; then will the end be, when God the Father deli-* "*vereth up the kingdom to him; when he* (God) *shall have* "*put down all rule, all authority and power, for he* (God) "*must reign until he hath put all enemies under his feet; the* "*last enemy that shall be destroyed is death, and when all* "*things shall be subdued unto him, then shall the Son also* "*himself be subject unto him that put all things under him,** "*that God may be all in all.*" (See verses 24 to 28.)

* In the adoption of the above translation, we have widely departed from the received text; our reasons for so doing are, that, whilst the common translation has given rise to the most opposing theories, it fails to convey to the mind any clear and connected view of the apostle's argument: this will be more clearly seen by comparing the 24th and 28th verses. In the former, "HE" that is to "*put down all rule, authority, and power*" is Jesus. In the latter, "HE" that is to "*put all things under him*" is God. In the 24th verse, when the "*end*" cometh, Jesus is to deliver up the kingdom to God. Now "*the kingdom*" (i. e. the church *of* God) is the kingdom or church *of* God—not the kingdom or church of Jesus; consequently Jesus could not "*deliver*" that up which was not his to deliver. To make the 25th verse accord with the common translation of the 24th, a new feature is appropriated to the Messiah's office: that of making him reign "*until* HE *hath put all enemies under* HIS *feet,*" when of him the declaration of the Supreme Being is, "Sit thou on my right hand, "until *I* make thine enemies thy footstool." See Psalm cx. Matthew xxii. 43. Acts ii. 34. Throughout the scriptures, the *punishment* of the enemies of truth proceeds *directly* from the Deity alone, whose benevolence is, in an equal degree, shewn, whether in punishing or in rewarding and exalting; and in relation to whom, when he hath put all enemies under his feet, he will then, when that is effected, deliver "*the kingdom*" to the government of his son, when "God shall be all in all," by the universal spread of the principles of the gospel. The authority in support of the translation which we adopt, is that of Gilbert Wakefield, who, instead of "*Then cometh the end, when he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the father,*" renders the passage "*Then will the end be when God the father delivereth up the kingdom to him*" (Jesus;) and this translation of Mr. Wakefield's is founded upon the Ethiopic version, which, in our judgment, clears up the difficul-

THE ORDER OF THE RESURRECTION, as thus stated by Paul, has given rise to much diversity of opinion; some maintaining that it is a relation of the several classes of mankind, which are all to rise at the general resurrection; others that it is a statement of—first, the resurrection of Jesus; second, the resurrection of the virtuous; third, that of the wicked, who, after having passed through the necessary state of discipline, shall be made virtuous and happy; and others esteem the verses, from the 23rd to the 29th, inclusive, to be descriptive of three distinct and distant periods: Firstly, the resurrection of Jesus; secondly, that of his devoted servants in every age, who, because of their obedience to the principles of the gospel, would be rewarded by being raised prior to the general resurrection; such being supposed to be those spoken of in the Revelations, as "*Blessed and holy is he* "*that hath part in the first resurrection, for on such the second* "*death hath no power, but they shall be priests of God, and of* "*Christ,*" Rev. xx. 6; a period of time, considered to be referred to by Paul in the Thessalonians, when the "*Lord himself shall descend, and the dead in Christ shall rise* "*first,*" (1 Thess. iv. 16) as a reward to such persons on the one hand, and on the other for the purpose of placing them in a situation to assist in the establishment of that promised state of things, in which God shall be "*all in all.*" We have deemed it well thus to submit these several modes of explaining a passage in the writings of the apostle of acknowledged difficulty; remarking, however, at the same time, that be the correct one which it may, our immediate argument as against the immaterialists, will receive full and equal support, seeing that in each it is the "*resurrection of* THE MAN *from the dead,*" not the possession of an immortal spirit, which is made the *sole* ground of hope for a future state of existence; and in perfect conformity with this view, are the finishing statements of the apostle, in which it is palpable, that an immaterial, immortal principle is not only not recognized by him, but that its admission would entirely destroy his argument. "*Behold, I shew you a mystery; we shall not all sleep, but we shall all* "*be changed;* FOR THE DEAD SHALL BE RAISED *incor-* "*ruptible,* (not the immortal souls) *and we shall be changed;* "*for this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal*

---

ties which most commentators have attached to these verses; and which Mr. Belsham, Vol. ii. 338, has said that "nothing perhaps but the great event can fully explain."

"*must put on immortality*," then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, "*death is swallowed up in victory*." Need we here point out that that which is immaterial cannot be corruptible, that that which is immortal can neither be called upon "*to put on*" immortality, nor can it become mortal; that the future existence of a being inherently immortal, could neither be "a *mystery*," nor "*a victory*," neither could it excite unexpected exultation: and the grand climax of the apostle, "*O death! "where is thy sting? O grave! where is thy victory?*" would have been a satire upon the understanding of those to whom he wrote, and could not have failed to have furnished his enemies with a triumphant weapon against himself; for, as Archdeacon Blackburn has shewn, "of what consequence is it "if they have immortal life by nature, whether they have it "by promise or not? what does it signify, whether they "have hopes of a resurrection or not, if they are sure of "a future life by provision, and allotment *without* a re-"surrection?"*

Having now brought to a close our scriptural remarks; we would just glance at an assertion which has been made by writers, whose sentiments in other particulars are much opposed to each other; namely, that a future state of existence is not a doctrine *peculiar* to Christianity. In support of this position, Mr. Sturch, in an equivocal chapter on a future state, asserts, "as a future state was *certainly* "*known* to both the Jewish and Heathen world, then "what becomes of what has been termed the peculiar "doctrine of the gospel?"† To which we have simply to remark, that the future state said to be *known* to the Heathen world, was one of merely wild theory, the views of which varied not only in every heathen nation, but also in that of the teachings of almost every eminent individual in those nations, and that the whole was built upon the presumed existence of an immaterial, immortal principle in man; but the scriptural doctrine of a future life, by means of a resurrection from the dead, and founded upon the fact of the resurrection of Jesus, a man like ourselves, (to appreciate which doctrine the *materiality* and consequent *mortality* of the entire man is indispensable,) can be proved most triumphantly to be a doctrine "*peculiarly*" of the gospel—a doctrine which the wise and the great among the heathens could not even comprehend; for when they heard

* Blackburn's Works, vol. iii. page 195.
† Apeleutherus, p. 214.

of Jesus, and of the resurrection, they supposed them to be strange gods; "*and when they* (the Athenian philosophers) "*heard of the resurrection of the dead, some mocked, and* "*others said, we will hear you again of this matter.*" (Acts xxxii.) A still more recent, and a much abler writer than the one just quoted, thinks fit to represent as being one and the same system—the doctrine of an immortal soul, and that of the resurrection from the dead; for "the im- "mortality of the soul, and a future state of rewards and "punishments were fully recognized in ALL the religions of "the ancient world, *except* the Jewish, and they are equally so "in those of more modern times." (Lawrence's Lectures, p. 8.) An opposite theory to that of Mr. Lawrence, in regard to the Jews, has been maintained by some Jewish as well as Christian writers: among the former, Ben Levi thinks "it "necessary to take notice of the falsity of what Christians in "general maintain; viz.—that the Jews were unacquainted "with the doctrine of the Resurrection."* This writer, however, commits that doctrine in *two* ways: *firstly*, By falling in with the heathen hypothesis of an immortal soul, which has been proved to be absurd and unphilosophical; and, *secondly*, by contending that the resurrection will be that of *the same* body, which also has been shewn to be impossible, and both proved to be alike unscriptural.

It would, however, seem to be the fact, that in the latter period of the Jewish history, some sects among that people had imbibed, doubtless from their intercourse with the heathen nations, the notion of an immortal principle; but it may be most safely asserted, that, *as a nation*, they had not that which, upon such a subject, can be the *only* authority for believing that we shall live again; namely, the authority of Revelation. The rewards promised to them, and the punishments threatened, were all of a temporal character, nor did the knowledge of a future life form any part of the Mosaic economy; but, considering that Judaism and Christianity are really but parts of one system, it is highly probable that the prophets and other eminently enlightened and virtuous men of the Jewish nation, were led to infer, from what they *did know* of the dispensations of God, that the present would not be the only state of our existence; and such an idea would receive support from the fact of Enoch and Elijah not having seen

* Levi's Dissertation on the Prophecies, p. 171.

death, as well as from many exalted passages in the prophetic writings descriptive of the character and attributes of the Divine Being. Still this must have been but conjecture, on their parts, and can, in relation to their sentiments, be but conjecture on ours; but this we do know, that "*Jesus the Christ* ***HATH BROUGHT LIFE AND*** "***IMMORTALITY TO LIGHT THROUGH THE GOSPEL.***" 2 Tim. i. 8. &c.) Such life and such immortality is indeed a doctrine peculiar to the gospel—a doctrine, which without an express revelation, man never could have placed confident hopes in; and we may safely assert, that the doctrine of the resurrection was not communicated to mankind before the proclamation of that gospel, of which it forms a leading and a vital part; that being one of "the great truths of "religion, and one of the fundamental principles of morals," it exactly possesses the recommendation which a writer before quoted, deems essential to the reception of such truths; "for Revelation alone is capable of dissipating "the uncertainties which perplex those who inquire into "the sources of these important principles."* So we say, and so we believe; but we maintain, that Revelation *has* dissipated these uncertainties, though it would seem to but little purpose in the instance of one who can be so utterly ignorant of what it has taught, as to confound the scriptural doctrine of the resurrection of the dead with the "sublime doctrine of all ages;" (i. e. the immortality of the soul) and then jeer at Revelation—not for what it does teach, but what, from his own ignorance of the subject, he deems fit to attribute thereto. That it is a doctrine which secures the object of future existence, without being incumbered with the palpable absurdities, and philosophical puzzles of the system of the immortality of the soul;—that it comports with the most enlightened reason, and the deepest philosophical and physiological research, and connected as it is with the nature, and fitted to secure the object of the Christian religion, it is, when justly appreciated, capable of supplying the most powerful motives, for perfecting the character, and insuring the happiness of man, as well in the present as in a future state of existence.

With this estimate of the scriptural doctrine of a future state, we cannot but reprobate the hypothesis of an immaterial and immortal soul, the belief of which, being opposed

* Lawrence's Lectures, p. 12.

to revelation, and tending to the destruction of a most valuable part of Christianity, has supplied the unbeliever with some of his most potent arguments against that system; and to such supporters of revelation, who may from old prejudices, still adhere to the heathen hypothesis, we shall conclude by quoting the well-expressed advice of Bishop Law. "If you have hurt your own cause, and corrupted "Christianity by an impure mixture of human wisdom, "falsely so called, or by the dregs of heathen philosophy; "if you have disguised the face of it, or rather substituted "something else in its room, and thereby put arms into the "hands of infidels, which they have used but too success-"fully against us; I ask whether it is not high time to "examine our Bibles, and try to exhibit the true Christian "plan as it is there delivered, and consider whether we "may not surely rest upon that solid rock of a resurrection, "without any of those visionary prospects which imagina-"tion is ever ready to furnish us with: whether by this "means we might not be able to move the seat of war into "the enemy's quarters, till at length he sees THE NECES-"SITY FOR SOME SUPERIOR GUIDE, AND SETS HIMSELF "IN GOOD EARNEST TO SEEK AFTER THAT LIGHT WHICH "CAME DOWN FROM ABOVE, AND WHICH ALONE CAN "LEAD HIM TO THE LIGHT OF EVERLASTING LIFE?"*

THE DOCTRINE OF THE FALL OF MAN DISPROVED.

ESSAY V.

After having explained, in our previous number, the fifth chapter of the letter to the Romans, and shewn that it did not teach or support the doctrine of the fall of man, this, which will, however, be our concluding Essay on the subject, might appear a work of supererogation. We make this remark, because the chapter in question is one which, from its peculiar phraseology, particularly in our incorrect and imperfect translation, has been made the prop of doctrines the most absurd and blasphemous. With great propriety, therefore, we might have left other passages

* Postcript to Theory of Religion, 427, &c.

unexplained, which, upon the face of them are so plain and obvious, that (except from the support which they derived from a misapprehension of the chapter above referred to) none but the most perverted minds could have interpreted in support of such doctrines. But, as it is our wish to satisfy, if possible, even the most fastidious stickler for orthodoxy, we shall proceed to explain such other passages in which any reference is made to our first parents, by the apostle Paul. And here, let it be again remarked, that the subject is never noticed at all by Jesus; and that Paul alone, of all the apostles of Jesus, ever refers to it, either directly or indirectly: nor is there any reference whatever to it after the three first chapters of Genesis, either by historians or prophets, throughout the whole of the Old Testament. This circumstance alone ought to be sufficient evidence to an honest and an enlightened mind, that anything respecting our first parents could not be of that supreme importance to their posterity, which it is generally imagined; or indeed of any importance whatever, further than as a matter of merely historical inquiry.

The first passage which, with the reservation above made, demands our attention, is 1 Cor. xv. verses 21, 22. Paul has here been combatting the opinions of some Saducean Christians, who, while they admitted the resurrection of Jesus, denied the general resurrection of the dead: he has shewn that one is so dependant on the other, that if "*the "dead rise not then is Christ not raised;*" and he concludes by asserting, that "*now is Christ risen from the dead, and "become the first fruits of them that slept.*" Having established this point, he asserts, that "*since by a man came "death, by a man will be also a resurrection of the dead; for "as by Adam all die, even so by Christ will all be made alive, "but each in his own order.*" Now let it be remarked, that the apostle is here speaking—not of the sin or transgression of mankind—but simply of the mortality of their nature, and their future resurrection to life; he says, indeed, that by Adam all die; but it is by the *nature*—not by the *sin*—of Adam, that this end is entailed upon us; of the fall of man from an original state of purity and *deathlessness*, (if we may be allowed to coin a word for the occasion) nothing whatever is said; and to such a fall there is not the remotest allusion. The assertion is absolute and unconditional—that by Adam—a man—the first man—came death; the inference is direct and plain, that the man by whom death was then entailed on his posterity, was himself mortal.

There is nothing whatever in the passage to warrant a suspicion to the contrary. Thus also it is said, that by Christ shall all be made alive;—but it is by the mission, and after the example of the resurrection of Christ—not in consequence of an atonement made by his sufferings and death. Of these last, indeed, no mention whatever is made;—no allusion is made from which such a doctrine could be inferred. That this interpretation is the correct one, is evident from the whole tenor of the argument. The apostle is reasoning in continuity, and draws his inference from the *succession* of events. Adam died, and after him all men have died, or will die. The Christ was raised from the dead, and after him all will, in the same manner, be raised from the dead; "*but every man in his own order: Christ the first fruits; "afterwards they that are Christ's at his coming; then cometh "the end,*" when all shall be raised; for "*the last enemy "that shall be destroyed is death.*" Adam and Jesus, therefore, are spoken of as each being at the head of a series of events;—at the beginning of a new order, or dispensation of things: it must be clear and obvious, therefore, that the apostle's meaning is this:—from, or by means of a man, Adam, we derived our present, mortal, fragile, and temporary existence; and, like the original, of whose nature we partake, we must all die; but, as we derived this nature from one man, so the future life of which the apostle had been speaking will, he argues, be commenced by, and derived from, another man—even Jesus the messiah, who, by his own resurrection to eternal life, is made the earnest to all men of a resurrection, and to the righteous, of an eternal state of felicity. The apostle, after having answered some other difficulty, propounded by his opponents, is led to a further and more full illustration of this subject, in consequence of a question proposed to him, as to "*how* the dead would be raised, and with what bodies they would come?" and he first shews, from the variety of bodies given by the Deity to the various things he had created, both celestial and terrestrial, all suited to their different purposes and designs, that God is not confined in his power; but that having given us a mortal and corruptible body here, he is equally able to give to us hereafter a body such as will suit our then situation, and change of circumstances. Thus having shewn that here, in this state of things, the flesh, or bodily form of the rational creature, man, was different from the flesh or form of the irrational, or brute creation; and that the glory of the moon and stars, which appears to

us to rule the night, are different from the more resplendent glory of the sun, which makes the day; so also, he argues, "*will be the resurrection of the dead. Man is sown in cor-* "*ruption—he is raised in uncorruption; he is sown in dishonour* "*—he is raised in glory; he is sown in weakness—he is raised* "*in power; he is sown an animal body—he is raised a spiritual* "*body:—there is an animal body, and there is a spiritual* "*body.*" All this, so far as regards the animal body, experience and our senses teaches us to be true; that which regards the spiritual must depend on our faith in the divine testimony. In confirmation of what Paul had said as regards the animal body, he refers to the original account, and says, "*and so it is written, the first man, Adam, became a* "*living soul:*" (animal.) See Gen. ii. 7. "*And the Lord* "*God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into* "*his nostrils the breath of life, and man* BECAME *a living* "*soul:*" (animal.) Here, let it be remarked, it is not said that man was made immortal, and afterwards forfeited his immortality; on the contrary, it is declared that he was made of the dust of the earth; and it was by God's breathing into his nostrils the breath of life, that he became a living animal.* The apostle, then, having, on the authority of the writer of the Book of Genesis, asserted that the first Adam was *made* a living animal, adds, that the last Adam was made a quickening spirit: or, as it might be better rendered, a spirit that giveth life, agreeable to the declaration of Jesus—John v. 26 to 29. "*For as the Father hath life in* "*himself, so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself,* "*and hath given him authority to execute judgment also,* "*because he is the son of man.*" Again, John xvii. 2. "*As* "*thou hast given him power over all flesh, that he should give* "*eternal life to as many as thou hast given them.*" Hence, then, we have the proof that the second Adam, by the appointment of God, is made a quickening spirit, or a spirit that giveth life; and according to his own words, in another place, "*the hour is coming when all that are in their graves* "*shall hear the voice of the Son of God,* (of this second Adam) "*and come forth,*" &c. In verse 46, the apostle, as though he had contemplated the future perversion of his words, and wished to prevent the possibility of any one's being so weak as to suppose that our first parent had, in the first instance, possessed a spiritual existence, guards the subject in the plainest language, by saying, in express terms,

* See note, p. 141, of this volume.

that "*the spiritual, however, was* NOT *first; but the animal,* "*and* AFTERWARDS *the spiritual.*" "The *first man*—a man from the ground—was dust. (See Gen. iii. 19. "*Till* "*thou return to the dust, for out of it* WAST *thou taken, for* "*dust thou* ART, *and unto dust shall thou return.*") The *second, a man* from heaven, was heavenly." (See 1 Thess. iii. 16. "*For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a* "*shout,*" &c.)* And lest any doubt should exist of his real meaning, he is not content with merely shewing the priority of existence of the natural to the spiritual man, and what were the distinct nature and character of the first and second Adam, but he also goes on to shew the nature of those who descended from the first; and what shall be the nature of those who are to be raised from the dead, in consequence of their affinity to the second: verses 48 and 49. "*They that are earthy, are like the Adam of the ground; and* "*they that are heavenly, like him from heaven; and as we* "*have borne the likeness of the earthy man, we shall also bear* "*the likeness of the heavenly.*" This is all in perfect agreement with what the same writer has said, Phil. iii. 20, 21. "*But we are citizens of heaven, whence, indeed, we are expect-* "*ing a deliverer—our Lord Jesus, the Christ who will change* "*this lowly* (earthy) *body of ours into the form of his glorious* "*body, according to that efficacy by which he is able even to* "*make all things subject to himself.*" Still anxious to make himself perfectly understood upon a point of so much importance, he adds, verse 50, "*I mean this,*" (or this is my meaning) "*brethren—that flesh and blood cannot inherit* "*a divine kingdom, nor will this corruption inherit the incor-* "*ruption thereof.*" Certainly not; our bodies, as at present constituted, would be entirely unfitted to such a state: they are composed of materials that, in their own nature, tend to decay; it is, therefore, impossible that they could be fitted for a state of things which is never to end. Having thus far established his point, he tells them that he will explain to them the mystery by which this happy change and fitness is to be effected, by the resurrection of the righteous dead in a state of incorruption and immortality; and the changing of those who may be living at the time, to fit them for an eternity of existence.

The whole of the apostle's reasoning in this chapter, is evidently then in perfect accordance with the view we have

* The quotations are from Wakefield's Translation.

taken of the three first chapters of Genesis, and also with other parts of the New Testament, which refer to the same subject; and as we conceive we have removed every difficulty on this subject which might be thought to belong to this chapter, we shall content ourselves with giving a paraphrase, by a very eminent scholar and critic, from the thirty-eighth verse to the end;—a paraphrase which makes the matter so clear, and places the apostle's reasoning in so luminous and striking a point of view, that any further observation from us becomes altogether superfluous.

"Shall we imagine, that the Being who annually renews the face of nature, and gives fresh life to the world of plants and vegetables (undoubtedly with the most benevolent intentions, that they may contribute to the support and delight of mankind) is either unwilling to exert himself in behalf of reasonable beings, or can find no resources in his power and wisdom for restoring *men* to life, and furnishing them with such bodies as are adapted to a more perfect and durable state of existence? This will appear still less credible, if we consider the immense variety, which reigns through the works of nature; and in what manner the Creator of all things has furnished the almost endless tribes of animals, which inhabit this globe, with a form and temperament peculiar to themselves, and at the same time exquisitely accommodated to their condition and ways of living. So that even all *flesh* is not of the same kind: but there is one sort appropriated to men, another to beasts, another to fishes, and another again to birds. And as there are terrestrial, so also celestial bodies, which differ from those on earth, and rise one above another in honour and pre-eminence. For there is one glory given to the sun, another to the moon; and the stars differ among themselves in lustre and magnitude. In like manner the resurrection of the dead, or the state of things which will take place hereafter, shall vastly exceed our present condition of mortality. For the frail houses of clay, which we now inhabit, are no more comparable to the glorious bodies which God will then give to his saints, than the most inconsiderable clod of the ground on which we tread, is to the bright luminaries of heaven. To acquire some faint idea of this superiority, let us consider, that a body is sown and buried in the ground, when it is just ready to putrify and be entirely dissolved; but it is raised incorruptible, and without the least tendency to a decay: it is consigned to the ground in a state of dishonour, when, the breath of God being departed, the dust returns to dust, and mingles with its native earth; but that which is raised appears with peculiar marks of honour and dignity, being allied to heaven, and assimilated to the image of our glorious Saviour: it is sown in weakness, the fine machine being totally disordered, the springs of life exhausted, its action ceased, and the organs of sense no longer able to perform any part of their wonted service; but it is raised with accessions of power and strength, and with an improved capacity of performing all the actions of a nobler life. An animal body is sown in the ground, once endued with the breath of life, but a life imperfect and momentary, subject to disease, sorrow, and travail; but a spiritual body is raised, of a more refined and perfect constitution, and which is superior to all the pains and evils of mortality.*

* The reader will remark how completely this paraphrase overturns the popular, but fallacious and anti-christian doctrine of an *immortal soul* in man.

"There is both an animal and a spiritual body. Of the first of these we have proof in the original formation of man: and it is thus written concerning our first parent Adam, when God animated the clay, which he had formed, with the breath of life, *And man became a living soul*, or animal. Of the second we have an example in the great restorer of the human race, who is become a quickening spirit; not only raised to this most perfect life in his own person, but invested with the power and office of conferring it upon others, and making them conformable to his likeness. However, the spiritual body is not first in order of time, but the animal constitution took place in the beginning; and that which is spiritual will succeed to it. It was the first man who was formed out of the ground, like his original, earthly and corruptible: the second man is the Lord, who shall descend from heaven; being, as was just now said, the pattern and introducer of a more perfect constitution. Such as was the man who was taken from the ground, such must they be who spring from this imperfect original; such as is the heavenly man, such also are they who are heavenly, like him, the children of God and of the resurrection. And as we have already borne the similitude of the earthly man, from whom we are descended, in our feeble and mortal bodies; so we must hereafter bear the similitude of the heavenly man, and be conformed to the image of our illustrious leader. And this not merely by way of advantage or distinction, which God is pleased to confer upon righteous men; but it is a change which must necessarily take place in every heir of immortality: because it is impossible that this frail system of flesh and blood, which we derive from our first progenitor, and by which we are subject to all manner of disease, and at length to death itself, which is its final dissolution, should inherit the everlasting kingdom of God; or that corruption should become the heir of incorruption and endless life.

"Attend and I will acquaint you with a wonderful event, of which you seem not to be aware: We shall not all of us die; for those upon whom the very last days of the world shall come, shall never taste death: but, considerable as this exemption may appear, so as to be greatly desired and envied by us, it is not of such a nature as to place them, who survive in this manner, foremost in the participation of the divine goodness, or put them in a better condition for receiving the promised inheritance.—For, contrary to what you may be ready to think of yourselves, and without being better informed, they who continue to the end of the world will stand in as much need of the peculiar favour of God, and his interposition by Jesus Christ, to qualify them for the durable blessedness of heaven, as if they had been held under the power of death through a long course of ages. Therefore, though we do not all die, we shall all be changed from what we are at present, and transformed at the glorious appearance of Christ into the image of his glory. This will be effected by an instantaneous operation of the divine power, when the last trumpet shall sound. For this event shall certainly take place, and the dead shall be first raised in a state of incorruption, that we may not be beforehand with those who sleep, in the possession of eternal life; and then we shall be changed, that we may be together with them and with the Lord, for ever and ever. For in order to this it is necessary, that, as the dead are raised incorruptible, so the frail corruptible bodies of those who remain should assume incorruption, and mortal constitution put on immortality.

"When this event, so peculiar and interesting, has been accomplished, then will be used, with the utmost propriety, that triumphant exclamation of the prophet's, Death is swallowed up completely in victory. O Death, what is now become of thy dreaded sting? O Grave, where is now thy wonted victory? Because the first is become impotent to destroy, and the latter

disappointed of his looked for prey. The sting of Death, which makes the thought of death alarming, and arms it with all its terrors, is Sin. And the power and force of Sin, that mortal weapon with which he is armed, is Law, and its condemning sentence. But thanks be to God, who giveth us the victory over Death, Sin, and the Law, by Jesus Christ, our Lord, and the instrument of his singular benevolence to the human race.

"Therefore, my beloved brethren, be firm and stedfast in this faith; do not suffer yourselves to be moved from the hope of the gospel; but always abound in the work of the Lord, bringing forth the fruits of righteousness, which are to the praise of him who hath called us to glory and virtue; being assured, upon the most reasonable evidence, that, notwithstanding the arts which some new teachers have used to instil into your minds a contrary persuasion, your labour will not be in vain in the Lord. For faithful is he, who hath called you, who will not disappoint your hope and confidence, if you keep it stedfast unto the end."—*A paraphrase of* 1 *Corinthians, chap.* 15. *By John Alexander.*

There now remains only one other passage that has any, the most distant reference to the subject in hand; and that is, 1 Tim. ii. 13. "*For Adam was* FIRST *formed,* THEN "*Eve; and Adam was not deceived, but the woman, being* "*deceived,* WAS IN THE TRANSGRESSION." The object of this statement, let it be observed, is not to prove the fall of man, but the *inferiority* of the woman, which the writer deduces from the facts, first, that Adam had the priority of existence by being first formed, and, second, that Adam was not deceived; but the woman, being deceived, was in the transgression, and thereby proved to be the weaker vessel. Were we to take this passage as it stands, so far from inferring that Adam was a sinner, we should suppose on the contrary, that no blame whatever attached to *him,* but that he was perfectly innocent, for it is expressly said, *he* was *not* deceived, but, that the woman being deceived, was alone the transgressor. But whoever will carefully attend to the apostle's object will readily perceive, that a word is wanting, in the way of supplement, to make sense of the passage; he is, as before said, shewing why the woman should be in subordination to the man: first, because he was first made; second, because she was, *not* the only transgressor, but the *first*; add then the word first, "the woman was *first* in the transgression," and the whole is in perfect keeping with the apostle's object, and the original account, in the book of Genesis.

Having thus, as we think, clearly proved that the doctrine of the fall of man, in consequence of the sin of Adam, is not a doctrine of the sacred scriptures, it follows, as a necessary consequence, that all the doctrines arising out of, or dependent upon it, must of necessity fall to the ground; such, for example, as that of the infinite wrath of deity, the

appeasing of which required an infinite atonement or satisfaction; the necessity that a divine person should take upon himself our nature, thathe might suffer on account of the sin, and of the fall of man; the natural depravity of the whole human race in consequence of the sin of one man; the existence of a devil to act upon this perverted nature, and all the other absurd and wicked doctrines deduced from or connected with the pretended fall of man; and as these doctrines are considered to contain the whole *mystery* of the Christian religion, it follows as a matter of course, that if the Bible be a faithful record of man, and the divine dealings with him, that which is *called* the Christian religion, or orthodoxy, must be false, and a wicked and cunningly devised fable; and if it be still contended, that these doctrines are true, and that they are Christian doctrines, it follows, that the Bible itself must be undeserving the attention of *such* Christians; that book being, as we have seen, totally in contradiction to all that is now called and taught as Christianity.* But as, on the one hand, we have such strong and convincing proof of the truth of the Bible; and as, on the other, the doctrines falsely called Christian, are so evidently wicked, blasphemous, and absurd: whilst we accept the one as a choice and glorious treasure of wisdom and knowledge, we must regard the other as a profane, wicked, and fallacious system, derogatory to the character of the Most High, and inimical to the virtue and the happiness of man.

It may, perhaps, be asked, if man be not depraved and corrupt in his nature, how do you account for the sin and wickedness that is, and ever has been, in the world? In the first place it may safely be denied, that there is upon the whole more wickedness than virtue in the world; which there, of necessity, must be, if men were naturally depraved; especially if we take into the account a necessary part of this system, that, in addition to his naturally corrupt and depraved disposition, man is exposed to the temptations of a being who is little short of omniscient, omnipotent, and omnipresent, whose wiles he has no means of detecting, and against whose machinations he can never

* That blasphemous book—Milton's Paradise Lost, is a better Bible indeed for such believers; and they should rest their authority on that and similar productions, and not on the sacred scriptures. These absurd and blasphemous doctrines may, indeed, be part and parcel of the law of the land, but of this we are sure, they form no part nor parcel of the law of God as contained in the Bible.

be upon his guard. Secondly, we would observe, that from the history of man, as contained in Genesis, and from all his after history, we find, that while all other animals were made perfect in their kind, and governed by unerring instinct, man is a creature imperfect in the first stage of his existence; but so framed and organized as that by instruction and experience he may attain to a degree of improvement and perfection, far exceeding that which other animals possess, or to which by possibility they can ever attain; but whilst he is striving after this perfection, the strength of his passions, yet uncorrected by prudence, and his weakness, yet uninstructed by experience, necessarily lead him into error; but even these, so far from implying or arising from any innate and natural depravity, are all means suited to his circumstances, and intended to develope his faculties, to enlighten his understanding, to improve and strengthen his character, and to give him eventually that perfection morally, which all other animals, as far as their nature and capacities extend, possess physically and instinctively. Thus we find that all the dealings of God, and all his revelations, as recorded in the scriptures, shew that the errors of man are the result of his *imperfect*, not of his *depraved* nature; and that they, together with the circumstances in which he is placed, are suited to such a being, and fitted to accomplish the object of eventually making him perfect.

Seeing then, that what is *called* Christianity, (of which the doctrine of the fall of man is the chief prop and support) has been proved to be false; we have a right, and we hereby exercise that right, to call upon all bishops, priests, deacons, missionary-society-men, and other teachers of these doctrines, upon all, indeed, who have in any way supported or encouraged a belief in such absurd, wicked, and degrading notions, under the pretence that they were the doctrines of God and his prophets, of Jesus and his apostles, to come forward and do justice to the sacred scriptures which they have belied—to the Deity whom they have blasphemed, and to mankind whom they have perverted and deceived; by acknowledging the falsehood of what they have taught, or honestly declaring that Christianity, in their opinion, is a pious or political fraud, a theory of human invention, merely encouraged for the support of kingcraft and priestcraft, to keep the multitude in a state of ignorance, and a servile dependance on their false teachers; and that the religion of Jesus is a religion altogether different from, and opposed to, the

religion taught by orthodox priests, and bolstered up by orthodox establishments.

Compelled as we have found ourselves, to hold up those doctrines so falsely called Christian, to universal abhorrence and contempt, we would recommend most earnestly to every man, that he should search the scriptures for himself, persuaded that he will find the doctrines they contain, the principles they establish, and the motives they hold forth, to be at once rational and important in the highest degree; suited to the most enlightened mind if virtuously disposed; calculated to give the most exalted views of the divine character and government as infinitely wise, benevolent, and good; and containing every thing necessary to make man wise, virtuous, and happy here, and to prepare and fit him for the enjoyment of happiness hereafter: he will find the religion as taught by Jesus and his apostles, to be in every way suited to, and worthy of God to give to such a creature as man, and every way worthy of man's most cheerful and grateful acceptance.

That the system we have been exposing should have so long prevailed is indeed astonishing; but that such should be the case was foreseen by the apostle Paul, and is predicted in the scriptures.* But, however it may have been permitted to prevail for purposes no doubt wise and benevolent, though to us inscrutable. The sacred writings assure us that the delusion shall come to an end;† and at a time when general knowledge and enlightenment has so extended in regard to all other subjects, it may be hoped that religion may come in for her share: for, in the language of Dr. Geddes, "*It is time that Christianity should learn to walk alone, "without Jewish leading-strings, or Gentile go-carts. It is "time that the pure spiritual religion of Jesus should throw "aside all the tawdry, cumbersome load of exotic ornaments, "borrowed either from Judaism or Paganism, from the temple "of Jerusalem, or the temples of Jupiter, and reclothe herself "in the white, spotless robes in which she was originally invested. "It is time for her rational admirers to vindicate her chaste "character from the aspersions of her professed enemies, and "from the false praise of her pretended friends; for the false "praise of her pretended friends has been often more injurious*

* 2 Thess. ii. 3—12; 1 Tim. iv. 1—2; 2 Tim. iv. 1—4; Rev. xvii. 5.

† See Rev. xviii. 1—10.

" to her reputation, than the obloquy of her professed enemies! " or, rather, she has had no enemies; but because her pretended " friends have exhibited her in a dress which she disclaims and " despises. Strip her at once of this ungainly meretricious " garb—restore her to her primitive simplicity, and she will " need only to be seen to be admired."

DISSENTERS' MARRIAGES.

"Let us not be weary in well doing; for in due season we shall reap, if we faint not."—PAUL.

UNDER the above title, in the first volume of our Register, p. 267, will be found an article, designed to exhibit to the reader the history and present state of the law with regard to marriage; to shew its inconvenience to dissenters holding doctrines contrary to those of the established church, and the means which have been used by the Unitarians generally, and by our own body more especially, to obtain legislative relief. The history of this important question, it will be seen, was brought up to the parliamentary session of 1823, and it concluded with noticing the result of the bill then brought into the House of Lords, by the Marquess of Lansdown, for granting relief to dissenters in this case. It is proposed, in what follows, to report the progress of this subject, from that period to the present; and to place upon record such documents as are presumed to be applicable to the merits of this question, and of a nature to strengthen and enforce that appeal which has hitherto been made in vain to the justice of the legislature.

The debate in the House of Lords, June 12, 1823, to which reference was made in our former article, was regarded as peculiarly favourable to the hopes of dissenters: the motion for going into a committee upon the bill designed for their relief, having been lost by a majority of *six* only, and the objections taken upon the occasion being rather to the *mode* than to the *principle* of relief. Since this period, it must be confessed, this favourable aspect has, in some measure, changed; and we have been compelled to experience a further delay of justice, and to witness another triumph of

bigotry and intolerance over liberty and the rights of conscience.*

The Marquess of Lansdown, upon the loss of his bill, in 1823, gave notice of his intention to renew his endeavours early in the ensuing session of parliament, but, during the intermediate recess, some zealot, alarmed for the safety of the established church, betook himself to writing a book, which appeared in the shape of a letter to the Marquess of Lansdown, published at York, and signed by "*A Member of the Church of England.*" The object of the church of England man was to prove, that dissenters are hostile to the church; that further concessions to them would be attended with increased danger to the establishment; that the Unitarians are not actuated by scruples of conscience against the marriage ceremony, as established by law, or the same would have been felt by their predecessors and they would not themselves adopt, in their *reformed Liturgy*, in the baptismal service, the same words, (*"In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost"*) to which they object in the marriage service. As these objections of the orthodox pamphleteer have subsequently obtained considerable notoriety, we shall notice them with that candour which becomes our profession, and which is worthy of men seeking an honest object by honest means. To the charge then of hostility to the established church, *we*, as dissenters, and on our own parts, plead *guilty*. Nothing short of such hostility, arising indeed from a conviction that the church of England is not the church of God, could justify our *dissent* therefrom. And if other dissenters, either from policy or mistaken candour, do not go the length of this plain, honest avowal, then are they guilty of the sin of *schism;* then are they *heretics* in the scripture sense of the term: that is, *fomenters of division*, for they have divided and weakened that church by their dissent, whose errors indeed they were bound to attempt to reform, but from whose communion they were never justified in withdrawing themselves so long as they held it to be the church of God. Let then the truth be at once, and openly avowed. The great body of dissenters are, or ought to be, hostile to the church upon PRINCIPLE, although that they are so upon other and lower grounds, we have never been studious to

* This article was written early in the month of March, *before* W. Smith had given notice of a motion in the House of Commons, to introduce a bill for the relief of Unitarians with regurd to the marriage ceremony. This bill is now in committee, and its fate will probably be decided at the time the present article is in the press.

conceal; for, if the clergy of the established religion feel the value of their privileges, their possessions, their tithes, and all the good things of mother church, they may rest assured, that the dissenting priesthood in general, who are only men like themselves, would be very happy to participate in the same, or even to exchange situations with them. For ourselves, indeed, *we* are without a priesthood, and, agreeably to the primitive plan, we admonish one another, not for filthy lucre, but of a ready mind; *we*, therefore, have no craving for the temporalities of the church; at the same time we confess that we have no such stoical contempt for the things of this life, as not to prefer to keep that which is our own; and, as we do not pay the teachers even of our own church, by whom we are instructed, so we confess we had rather stand excused from paying the teachers of another church, by whom we are not instructed. In a word, the established religion takes much *from* us, and does nothing *for* us; except, therefore, upon the principle of returning good for evil, it cannot be supposed the church can have any claim upon our goodwill!

If then dissenters generally are so opposed to the church, as is contended for on the one hand, and as we, on the other, so readily allow, will it not follow that further concessions to them must be attended with danger to the church? We hope not, and believe not. We hope not, because, as long as the state deems it fitting to maintain a state religion, we should prefer the church as it is, rather than the church as it would be, if, unhappily, any of the popular sects of dissenters were to be exalted to power, who, to all the evils of an established religion, would superadd ignorance, hypocrisy, and intolerance, from which qualities the church is, in a great measure, free. We believe, in common, indeed, with many of the most enlightened friends of the church, that concession would *not* be dangerous to the church in the present instance, because the thing to be conceded is just, because the church can only refuse concession by a denial of justice, and at the risk of increasing the opposition of those whom it already regards as its enemies. Concession, therefore, in this case, instead of weakening, would rather give strength to the church, by depriving its opponents of a fruitful source of declamation; and the circumstance of those who prefer the claim being the enemies of the church, is an additional reason why it should be more speedily adjusted; for, whilst indulgence may be taken in settling an account between friends, we are the more prompt in discharging a debt which is due to an enemy.

The charges brought against the Unitarian body, by the "*Member of the Church of England,*" it will be more difficult to dispose of. This writer accuses them of inconsistency in *now* feeling scruples to a ceremony, to which themselves and their fathers had so long submitted without a murmur. As we have so frequently in times past condemned the Unitarian body for submitting, without complaint, to the church marriage service, it is not for us to defend them from an accusation like the present; at the same time, though late, we feel gratified that they have at length come forward in the cause of conscience, and it is not because they have not done so sooner, that they are not now entitled to relief. We allow, also, the force of the objection, which is taken from the fact of the Unitarians retaining in the baptismal service of the reformed liturgy, the terms "*Father,* "*Son, and Holy Spirit.*" Indeed, the use of any liturgy at all is wholly without authority from scripture, and is, in the enlightened Unitarians of the present day, an unworthy compliance with popular habits and prejudices. We regard it, indeed, as a pityful device to obtain popularity—a mere trap laid for churchmen; and one cannot look into the liturgy, as published and used by the Essex-street Unitarians, without being reminded of the *imitation labels* of Day and Martin's Blacking, and without suspecting that the imitators in both cases are actuated by similar motives. We are bound, however, to remark, that it is by a portion only of the Unitarian body, that the liturgy is either used or approved; the whole body, therefore, may justly complain, if relief be denied them on account of the conduct of a few; and much more may the Freethinking Christians complain at being concluded by the acts of others, to which they were no parties, and against which they have never ceased to raise their voices. These objections of the "*Member of* "*the Church of England,*" which we have so far noticed, seem to have formed the ground work of the efforts which were to be made against Lord Lansdown's intended bill; they were copied into a vituperative article, which appeared in the *John Bull,* Sunday Newspaper, together with certain extracts from the article on "*Dissenters' Marriages,*" in our Register, and published the 28th of March, 1824, the Sunday before the debate, on the second reading of the bill, in the House of Lords, and were reiterated by certain of the right reverend prelates, who spoke upon the motion.

The opposition, thus organized and conducted, proved, as we shall presently see, fatal to the measure of relief then pending; although we are willing to hope, that the

attention which was thereby drawn to the subject, and the discussion it underwent, were calculated ultimately to secure the triumph of our cause, which requires only to be understood in order to prove successful. In the article just alluded to in the *John Bull*, it was with pleasure, we saw extracted from our Register, some of the scenes which have taken place in the church, upon the marriage of certain of our members, together with a copy of the *protest* against the marriage ceremony, first presented in 1814, to the Rev. Robert Crosby, the minister of St. Leonard's, Shoreditch. In recording the circumstances of this marriage, we felt ourselves bound in justice to acknowledge the liberal conduct of the officiating minister; upon which JOHN BULL took the alarm, and, holding it impossible for a minister of the church to treat with liberality the scruples of conscience, expressed his hope that this might prove "*a "misrepresentation of the facts.*"—This produced a letter in the following paper from the Rev. Robert Crosby himself, who, it would appear, was oppressed by our praise, and in the spirit of Christian humility, declared himself unworthy. Notwithstanding, however, the gentleman's disavowal, we must still be allowed to think that his conduct was wholly free from bigotry, and that whilst he acted consistently with the duties of his office, he evinced a liberal and proper consideration for the feelings of others. Speaking of this marriage, and of the conduct of the parties, the reverend gentleman concludes by saying, "*It is true, when I had pronounced the church's ratification thereof, and was proceeding to the name of the* BLESSED TRINITY, *they turned their attention to another part of the Church, and I* WAS LEFT ALONE TO CONCLUDE THE SERVICE."

Now, we would ask Mr. Crosby, as a minister of the church, whether *he* is of opinion that a rite of the church *so* solemnized, is calculated to give support to the church, to add sanctity to its institutions, or to be attended with advantage to its ministers; and yet this is a state of things produced by the law, and which the mistaken, and misguided friends of the church, who have opposed themselves to an alteration of the law, are determined shall continue.

We proceed to notice the debates in the House of Lords upon the Marquess of Landsdown's bill, in the parliamentary session of 1824, which were extremely animated, and evinced a better knowledge of the merits of the subject than was conveyed by the discussion of the same question in the preceding session. The bill brought into parliament in the session of 1823, was, it may be observed,

of a most comprehensive character, being designed to include the case of the Catholics as well as of all dissenters who pleased to avail themselves of its provisions, and for *this* reason it was objected to by the Lord Chancellor, and finally lost. The bill of 1824, was, on the contrary, so narrowed as to apply only to the case of the Unitarians, so much so indeed, as to render it doubtful whether, if it had passed into a law, the members of our own church could have derived benefit from its enactment. This complete change, however, in the character of the bill, proved of no advantage to its supporters, for the Lord Chancellor, who held that the former bill was too general, objected that the present was too particular;—before, he refused to grant relief to *all* classes of dissenters, and now he objected to relieve *one* class.

The debates upon the Marquess of Landsdown's bill took place upon its second reading, April 2, 1824, and upon the motion that the bill be committed, May 4th. The motion for the second reading was carried by a majority of *two* only, the division appearing as follows:—

Content	21,	Proxies 14 -	35
Not Content	20,	Proxies 13 -	33
			2

Upon the motion that the bill be now committed, an amendment was moved by the Bishop of Chester, that it be committed *this day three months;* and upon the house dividing on the amendment, the numbers were

Content	55,	Proxies 50 -	105
Not Content	41,	Proxies 25 -	66
		For the amendment -	39

By which means the bill was lost.

The lords who advocated the measure for relief, were Lord Landsdown, Lord Liverpool, Earl of Harrowby, Lord Holland, Lord Calthorp, the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Bishop of London, the Bishop of Exeter.

Those who spoke in opposition, were the Lord Chancellor, the Earl of Westmoreland, the Bishop of Chester, the Bishop of St. David's. The arguments in favor of the bill were, as it seemed to us, unanswerable and unanswered. The Marquess of Lansdown, whose whole conduct in this business has been truly honorable and enlightened, made out a complete case, which was untouched by any thing offered in reply. We, however, do not purpose reporting

the debates, but shall content ourselves with placing upon record certain admissions and statements made upon this occasion in favour of the cause of conscience, by the ministers of the crown, and dignitaries of the Church; our extracts will be made from the *Times* report.

THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY said, the object of the bill "was the ease of the Unitarian and the security of the Church." - - - "It had been said, that it was extraordinary that this favour should be granted to the Unitarian Dissenters, and yet be refused to others; but the ground on which the legislature proceeded was not favour, but a regard to conscientious scruples, and *where they existed they certainly were entitled to relief.*" (*Times, April* 3, 1824.)

"It was certainly true, as had been observed, that the Unitarians denied the doctrine of the Trinity, but he wished those who opposed the bill to consider well what it was for which they contended. *Was it their wish to enforce a seeming acquiescence in doctrines against the consciences of men?* The consequence of maintaining such a practice must be, that ceremonies would be administered in one sense, and received in another. What was this but A SYSTEM OF THE GROSSEST PREVARICATION?" (*Times, May* 5.)

THE BISHOP OF EXETER "was of opinion, that persons who did not believe in certain doctrines ought not to be compelled to join in ceremonies depending on those doctrines." (*Times, May* 5.)

THE EARL OF LIVERPOOL "could not conceive the possibility of danger or of injury to the established church from the provisions of this bill. What did they do? They merely placed a certain class of dissenters on the footing on which they were *prior to the passing of Lord Hardwick's act.*"

"Apprehensions had been expressed with respect to the security of the church establishment if this bill passed. Nothing could be more unfounded. Though differing with the noble baron opposite, (Lord Holland) on many essential points respecting the church, he agreed with him in not construing a measure like this into a source of danger, and could not sound an alarm were he felt perfect security." (*Times, May* 5.)

THE EARL OF HARROWBY "would fairly confess that he could easily conceive how serious objections might arise in the mind of a party who entertained a conscientious conviction, that the appellations and attributes of God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost, where improperly applied and invoked in the ceremony to which the bill related; he would put the case to their lordships personally; would any of their lordships, supposing that he were about to be married, permit himself in the progress of the marriage ceremony, to be addressed in the name of *Mahomet* for instance?

"Marriage in this country had always been considered as in itself a *civil contract;* but it was a contract to which the legislature had very properly thought fit to add a religious sanction; and what was the object of superadding such a sanction? clearly to bind the consciences of the parties to the observance of the contract, by rendering it a religious as well as a civil act. But while, in the case of Unitarians, the law required them to acquiesce in certain observances, under the authority of particular articles of faith, to which articles they did *not* subscribe; THE LAW WAS COMPELLING THEM TO VIOLATE THAT VERY RELIGIOUS ACT WHICH IT HAD ITSELF PRESCRIBED." (*Times, April* 3.)

Brief will be the task, although painful the duty, of refuting the objections, which, according to the reports, were, urged against the bill by those lords, both temporal and spiritual, whose station, learning, and habits, as members of the legislature,

might be presumed to raise them above the narrow bigotry, the pedling views, and vulgar prejudices, which were perfectly in place in the pages of the York Pamphleteer, or the columns of the John Bull newspaper.

First in order, we proceed to notice the objections of the Bishop of Chester. This prelate declared that, "*In his "opinion, the Unitarians had no reasonable grounds for their "objections to the marriage ceremony. The words in question "were the words of scripture—the words of our blessed Lord "himself—and could not be altered without compromising the "doctrines and the dignity of the established church. That the "Unitarians had no ground for objecting to the words used in "the marriage ceremony was evident from this circumstance—"that they themselves adopted the same words in their baptismal "ceremony.*" Now we have already remarked, that only a portion of the Unitarians use the baptismal ceremony alluded to, and we have condemned such use in any of them; but as his lordship declared, "*If any noble lord would show him "any just reason for the objection of the Unitarians, he would "give his consent to the bill*"—we will undertake to do this, and shall be happy to find, when the question comes again before the house, that we have secured his lordship's vote. The minister of the church then, when performing the marriage ceremony uses these words, "FATHER, SON, AND "HOLY GHOST" in *a particular sense*, as expressive of the doctrine of *the Trinity*, and nothing else, those words being explained by the language afterwards occurring in the ceremony—"*God the father, GOD the son, and GOD the "holy ghost.*" The Unitarian who adopts the words in question in the baptismal ceremony in *his own* chapel, uses them in a *different* and an *opposite* sense. If then the Unitarian be required to come into the church of England, and if, agreeably to the directions of the rubric, TAUGHT *by the priest, he shall say*—"IN THE NAME OF "THE FATHER, AND OF THE SON, AND OF THE HOLY "GHOST," he is supposed by the use of the *same* words with the priest, before the *same* altar, and as a party to the *same* religious act, to mean the *same thing*, and to express the *same doctrine:* and if, on so solemn an occasion as the performance of a *joint* and *social act of worship*, it is said that he may attach an *opposite* meaning to the terms used to that intended by the minister, we ask, in the language of the learned metropolitan Bishop, "WHAT IS THIS BUT A "SYSTEM OF THE GROSSEST PREVARICATION?" So much on behalf of the Unitarians; but we choose now to speak of ourselves.—WE, the Freethinking Christians, have been

the first to raise objections to the marriage ceremony—We have felt the inconsistency of joining in the performance of this rite with a minister of the established Church, from the period of our first existence as a body—OUR petitions for relief are yet on the table of the House of Lords—WE say that not merely the particular words alluded to violate our consciences, but that the whole ceremony, as an act of *public worship*, and *a rite of the* established Church, is a violation of our conscience and an infraction of our *civil liberties*—WE do not use the above words in the baptismal service—we have no baptismal service; and, finally, WE do *not* believe that "the words in question," *are* "the words of our blessed "Lord himself." We believe these words, (Matt. xxviii. 19) like the corresponding words, 1 John v. 7., to be an *interpolation*—These two passages are the only ones in Scripture which would seem to countenance the idea of a trinity of persons in the Godhead; the latter is allowed even by Church authorities to be a corruption of the text, and our reasons for thinking the former to be so, were set forth at large by us many years ago. *—WE then, with these views, whether well or ill founded is not the question, WE have just reason to object to the marriage ceremony as established by law.—Will his lordship consent to a bill to give US relief?

The learned prelate observed in conclusion that, "*If the "marriage ceremony was to be altered it was not easy to "see what would be the consequence of such encroachments.—"If one stone was to be removed after another, what would "become of the building? He trusted that their lordships "would not agree to any infringement of the doctrines and "discipline of the Church of England.*"

The answer to these doleful forebodings is, that the bill did not propose to alter the marriage ceremony—it did not propose to move a single stone of the building—it did not propose a single infringement of the doctrines and discipline of the Church of England.—It proposed merely, that Unitarians who are permitted by law to teach *ther own* doctrines, and to maintain *their own* discipline, should be allowed to marry in *their own* chapels consistently with such doctrines and discipline.

* See the Freethinking Christians' Magazine for 1811, vol. i. article *Baptism*; and, in addition to the evidence there adduced, it may be remarked, that the apostles never did baptize in the name of "*the Father, and of the Son and, of the Holy Ghost*;" but, on the contrary, in the "name of the Lord Jesus." See Acts ii. 38; viii. 16; xix. 5.

The law in its wisdom permits the Unitarian openly and publicly all his life long, to oppose the doctrines and discipline of the Church, and yet the good Bishop fancies the Church is in danger, not from this wise toleration, but because the Unitarian upon a single occasion in his life, seeks to be excused conformity to that which on every other occasion he condemns and reprobates. A similar confusion also appears from the reports, to have rested upon the mind of the Bishop of St. David's. "*He observed, that the doc-*" *trines to which the Unitarians objected were those of the* " *majority of Christians, and what all members of the Church* " *of England must consider to be essential to Christianity.*"

The only conclusion which in the 19th century can be involved in this statement is—let then the majority of Christians so called, and the members of the Church of England, maintain their opinions, and let the Unitarians maintain their objections.—But adds the Bishop "*I cannot consent* " *to the giving up a point of so much importance which in-*" *volves the denial of the doctrine of the Trinity;*" what *point* is it which the pious prelate intends, or which he wishes to make?—Does he mean he cannot consent to give up the doctrine of the Trinity? if so, no one has had the presumption to require, or the folly to expect he should do so; well-knowing that if the reverend prelate were to give up the doctrine of the Trinity he must *give up* much more. Does he mean that he cannot consent that others should be allowed to deny the doctrine of the Trinity? If so, this is an intelligible proposition, and it may be also true as far as the good bishop is concerned. But then the law, to which the highest as well as the lowest must yield submission—the law *has* consented to permit others to deny the doctrine of the Trinity.—The legislature by repealing the 9th & 10th of William, which attached certain penalties to persons denying the doctrine of the Trinity *has* consented "to the " giving up a point of so much importance, which involves " the denial of the doctrine of the Trinity;" and the Unitarian merely petitions the legislature in the instance of marriage, to carry to a consistant conclusion the principle upon which that tolerant and enlightened measure passed into a law.

As, therefore, the legislature have evinced a just consideration for the rights of conscience; and, as we hope, we have corrected the mistake of the two learned prelates, by showing that it was not the doctrines of the Church, or the consciences of its members, that the petitioners sought to

interfere with, but that they sought only the free exercise of their *own* doctrines—the ease of their *own* consciences, it may be presumed these worthy prelates will, on a future occasion, be among the advocates of our cause, the more especially as the late Bishop of Chester prefaced his speech against us by declaring "*There was no noble lord that was "more decidedly friendly than he was to the principle of re-"ligious toleration. He agreed that in the intercourse between "the creature and the Creator* NOT A RESTRICTION SHOULD "PREVAIL, *but that it should be* FREE AS THE AIR WE "BREATHED!!"

We were, we confess, not a little surprized to observe from the report, that the acute mind of the Lord Chancellor had got entangled in the same error as in that which the learned Bishops had been involved. His lordship avowed, that "*the great objection which he had to the bill was, that the doc-"trine of* THE TRINITY *was the doctrine of the Church of "England, and those who denied it must have a system as dif-"ferent as light and dark.*" Really one would have supposed that this had been the language of an advocate for the bill. The doctrine of the Trinity is the doctrine of the Church of England; this is what we say—it is not *our* doctrine—we are dissenters from the Church; those who deny it must have a system as different as light and dark, this is what we ask—this is our case—but the *corollary* of the learned lord is, that they ought to have the *same* system. In other words, because they are placed in extremes with respect to religious opinion, therefore they ought to use the *same* confession of faith. So also upon the second debate, his lordship remarked "*If he understood the doctrines of "the Church of England at all, it was impossible that there "could be a greater repugnance between any doctrines, than "between the doctrines of the Church of England and the "Unitarians. The Unitarians must think the Church of "England* IDOLATRY."—True my lord!—but what then?—that Unitarians ought not, therefore, to be compelled to conform, where such repugnance exists?—that they ought not to be rendered a party to such supposed idolatry?—This would be the conclusion of common sense—of common feeling, not to take the higher ground of conscience—but the conclusion of the Lord Chancellor of England—the supreme judge of the court of *Equity* is, that they should subscribe what they do not believe, and practice what they condemn!!

One other objection of a different kind remains to be

noticed, it was adverted to by two or three of the reverend prelates, but we will take it in the words of the Bishop of Chester. "*There was another consideration, though one to which he did not attach much weight; they must not lay the flattering unction to their souls, that those privileges must not be conceded to all other sects; and the consequence would be, a great falling off of marriages in our Church, and a proportionate diminution of their incomes. He allowed that no stress should be laid on that—FIAT JUSTITIA, RUAT CŒLUM. But as the fees were complimentary, a great proportion of the incomes of the clergy in his diocese, was derived from this source, and their lordships were not, he was persuaded, prepared to say, that the little income of the clergyman should be made less.*"

Here, of course, we enter into the counting house: this is an affair of business, and upon that understanding, the Unitarians proposed in their bill, to pay the clergyman, for registering the marriage, the same fee as the law had heretofore allotted him for celebrating the marriage; as, however, it appears the clergy entertain some objection to this mode of payment, and as, upon principle, we object to any class of men being *paid* for the performance of religious duties, whilst at the same time we commisserate the situation of the *poor* clergy as much as the poor of any other class, we will put it to the candour of the Bishop of Chester whether it would not be as creditable to the Church, if the *rich* clergy were to take the charge of relieving their poorer brethren—if they were to increase their "*little incomes*" from their own abundant benefices, rather than throw the burden on those who have dissented from the church, and renounced its communion?

We are bound, in dismissing our remarks upon the debate in question, to confess, that the objections taken to that part of the bill, which provided that in the case of *one* of the parties only being Unitarian, liberty should be granted to celebrate the marriage in the Unitarian forms, appeared to us well founded. All such marriages, in our opinion, are in themselves ill-judged, and contrary to principle, and we have no wish that the legislature should give facility to their solemnization. But to all the other objections opposed to granting relief, on the ground of such relief being dangerous to the church, the short but conclusive answer is, that we pray only for an alteration of a single act of parliament, as far as relates to the recognition of the church marriage service. The church of England continued

secure for a period of two hundred years prior to the passing of that act—it was never passed with a view to give security to the church—it has never contributed in any way to produce such security—and in all the instances of the marriage of the Freethinking Christians under that act, we think the cause of the church has been rather damaged than promoted thereby, as we have no doubt could be evidenced by the testimony of a host of clerical witnesses!

With these observations we conclude our notice of the debates in the House of Lords, which ended, as we have stated, in the rejection of the bill intended for the relief of the Unitarians, and we proceed to direct the attention of the reader to certain circumstances in which our own body have been more immediately the actors.

On the 5th of December, 1824, two of the members of our church were married at the church of St. Stephen's, Coleman Street, and, on the following day, there appeared in the *Times* and *Chronicle*, daily papers, the following statement of particulars.

YESTERDAY morning was married, at the parish church of St. Stephen, Coleman Street, Mr. William Woods to Miss Sophia Hodges. This was the first instance of presenting a protest against the marriage ceremony of the church since the rejection of the Marquis of Lansdown's bill for granting relief to Protestant dissenters entertaining scruples with regard to the established ceremony, and the following scene took place:—

The parties being assembled in the vestry-room, the minister inquired of the bridegroom if he intended to present a protest against the ceremony. Upon being answered in the affirmative, he said, "Then I don't marry you. I shall not marry you if any protest is presented." One of the parties assembled then asked the minister if it was his intention to refuse to marry the party? When he replied, "I have nothing to say to you, Sir; if you interrupt, I shall commit you to the custody of a constable." Upon which the party answered that he was not guilty of any interruption; his presence as a friend and neighbour of the party, being recognized by the rubric, and consistent with the law of the land.

When at the altar the bridegroom presented a written protest, which the minister, who was accompanied by the churchwardens, declared he would not receive; repeating that *a constable* was in attendance to take into custody any party who should interrupt the ceremony. The minister having on this occasion read the whole of the service, on their return to the vestry-room, the gentleman who had given away the bride, addressed the minister as follows:—"May I now, Sir, say a few words to you? Did we not wait on you on Friday last, to explain to you that the parties had conscientious scruples with regard to the marriage ceremony?" "You did." "Did we not inform you that they would present a protest against that ceremony?" "You did." "Did you not state that you would receive that protest?" "I did." When the gentleman exclaimed, "Then, Sir, before what you esteem the altar of God, you have broken your promise." In reply to which the minister pleaded that he had since changed his mind. One of the parties present having exclaimed, "What! a minister of the church change his mind after having given a solemn promise!"—the party who had previously

spoken, holding a Bible in his hand, asked the minister if he respected that book, emphatically reading aloud the following passage from the Psalms (ci. 7.), "He that worketh deceit shall not dwell within my house; he that telleth lies shall not tarry in my sight."

After some strong remarks upon the threat which had been used of meeting conscientious scruples by an appeal to *a constable*, the whole party retired. The following has been handed to us as a copy of the protest delivered on this occasion:—

"The undersigned members of the church of God meeting in London, being Protestant Dissenters, and commonly known by the name of Freethinking Christians, in obediance to the dictates of their own consciences, and in accordance with the instructions of the church to that effect, hereby protest, as well as on the part of the Church as on their own part, against the use, in their instance, of the marriage ceremony as contained in the Book of Common Prayer, to which ceremony, though the same be contrary to their belief, they are compelled to submit, as the only means of obtaining a legal marriage. They feel themselves compelled to protest against such ceremony for the following reasons:—

"1st. Because, whilst admitting the *civil* institutions of the country, they deny the *Scripture* authority of the Church of England to decree rites and ceremonies; much less to impose such on those who *dissent* from her community.

"2dly. Because, whilst admitting the civil, they do not admit the spiritual authority of the minister by whom the marriage ceremony is performed; believing the Jewish priesthood to have been superseded by Christianity, and none other to have been instituted by Christ.

"3dly. Because they do not believe in the doctrine of the Trinity, in the name of which the marriage ceremony is solemnized, this doctrine appearing to them, and being by the Christian church of which they are members, publicly represented to the world, both in writing and discourse, as but one of the many lamentable corruptions of Christianity, alike repugnant to reason and contrary to Scripture.

(Signed) "W. WOODS,
"S. HODGES."

This statement, printed as we have said in the *Times* and *Chronicle*, was also copied into the following papers —the *Courier*, the *Morning Post*, the *Star*, the *Globe and Traveller*, and the *Ledger*; it appeared in several of the provincial journals, and even found its way into the *French* papers. None of the government prints in our own country, ventured to censure the conduct of our friends, or to treat with levity the complaints of conscientious dissent from the church—this task was reserved for a single journal, and that one claiming to advocate the interests of liberty and independence. The French papers, indeed, both *ultra* and *liberal*, united in condemning the intolerance evinced in England, in the above instance, to the scruples of conscience. Indeed, the report of the marriage and protest of our friends, was viewed by the French editors as matter of peculiar interest, touching the efforts then making, by the advocates of priestly despotism

in France, to place marriage again, in that country exclusively in the hands of the clergy; and to assimilate the enlightened law of France, upon this subject, to the oppressive principle of the English law: in a word, what the enlightened here are seeking to remove, the corrupt in France are endeavouring to restore. The *Etoile*, an *ultra* French paper, and consequently the advocate of the corrupt claims of the church with regard to marriage, inserted on the 10th December, the account of the marriage and protest of our friends, at St. Stephen's, Coleman Street; but, at the same time, condemned in the strongest manner, the intolerant conduct of the minister in rejecting the protest of our friends, and his threatening to call in the civil force; upon which concession the *Courier Français*, a *liberal* paper, offered the next day the following spirited and appropriate animadversions:—

"THE *Etoile* exclaims against the ENGLISH LAW, and it is a *similar law* which the Jesuits wish re-established in France. Among us it is wished that marriage and baptisms, under the pain of their being *declared null*, should be consecrated by the priests of the dominant religion; dissenters are to be forced, by a *tyrannical law*, to submit to forms and ceremonies *not in unison with their creed*. It will not certainly be said, that the Catholic church is more tolerant than the English church; it refuses the rites of sepulchre to an aged man suspected of Jansenism—the doors of the church are closed against an unbelieving sponsor; and it is still asserted, that if a law established among us the same relation as in England, there would be no difficulty in the way of dissenters from the church, obtaining the nuptial benediction; and that their *protests*, if they made any would be viewed more tolerantly by the *gens d'armes*, than by the *English constables*. A WISE LAW now separates the civil attestation from the religious ceremony. This law, which cannot be altered without violating that part of the charter which proclaims *liberty of conscience*—allows the citizens to remain satisfied with the civil attestation, or have recourse to the religious ceremony; all consciences, therefore, may be satisfied; all rights are guaranteed; and those important acts of life are not exposed to scruples and caprices which ought not to be acknowledged by the law. As long as the religious ceremony is not imposed by the law, the priests will shew themselves tolerant, and intolerance becomes rare, and less dangerous when it exists. It is this *admirable order of things* which the fanatics desire to destroy. And what will they substitute? an order of things which they themselves call *tyrannical, odious, oppressive, unbearable*, when established in countries not catholic. They condemn it in *England*, and want to introduce it into *France*. The law which they call *tyrannic*, when established for the benefit of the English clergy, they think excellent when established in favour of the catholic priests: they have now, however, pronounced their own condemnation. Who will now praise the plan of a law which is to make the civil attestation subordinate to the religious ceremony? It can never be more victoriously combatted than in quoting the fact mentioned by the *Etoile*, and the remarks which accompany it.

From these judicious and liberal comments of the French Editor, we turn, not without a feeling of concern, to the

narrow-minded, flippant, and specious criticisms on the conduct and protest of our friends, which appeared in the *leading article* of the THE TIMES Newspaper, on the day after its publication of those proceedings.

"WE inserted an article from a correspondent yesterday, on the subject of a protest tendered to a clergyman of the church of England, by a couple about to be married, against the ceremony, according to which the clergyman was bound by his duty and solemn obligation to perform the rite. The manner in which we have here stated the case will shew our opinion upon it. If the clergyman had previously promised to accept the protest, he had inadvertently entered into an improper engagement, from the infraction of which, however, the party with whom the engagement was made could receive no damage; for what good could this protest do them, unless the degradation of the parish priest were a good to those who were married by him? What have the clergy of the established church to do with protests of this nature? Or where is the acceptance of them enjoined as a part of their duty? It is not optional with them to use or to omit a part of any of the church ceremonies. They pledge themselves, and are solemnly bound at their ordination, 'to comply with the liturgy of the church of England;' their hands, therefore, are tied; and it seems excessively foolish to pester them with protests in an affair totally beyond their controul. It would be quite as rational in the clergyman to give the couple a protest on account of their faith, as for them to give him one on account of a rite contained in the Book of Common Prayer. Indeed, it appears to us, that if a dissenting couple must tender a protest on account of their being married in the church, and according to its ritual, the minister of their own dissenting congregation is the proper person to whom the protest should be tendered, and by whom it should be received; for by such a process he learns, and is assured, that though this portion of his flock may seem to quit him on the most important occasion of their lives, it is only because the existing law of the land forces them, and that he is not, therefore, to esteem them as renegades and deserters.

"The particular protest, however, in question (that signed by W. WOODS and S. HODGES) possesses a degree of absurdity peculiar to itself; from which, perhaps, ingenuity might contrive to purify similar documents in future. The parties protesting first go to the church, and *then* and *there* they protest 'against the use in their instance of the marriage ceremony, as contained in the Book of Common Prayer.' Now, suppose for a moment, that the clergyman had been inclined to violate his duties, and having got the couple into the church, had professed his readiness to save them the trouble of a protest, by marrying them according to any other form they might wish. *Would they have suffered him?* Would they have been content to place the validity of their marriage upon so rotten a foundation? Certainly not. They, therefore, protest to the officiating minister against his marrying them by the prescribed form, whilst at the same time they would not suffer him to marry them by any other. Does not this absurdity prove, that the clergyman is not the person to whom the protest should be presented? He does not force *them* to be married according to the ritual of the church of England; they enter the sacred temple voluntarily, and would force *him*, if he should attempt to diverge, to use that ritual. The protest then goes on to say, or to complain, that the parties are compelled to submit to the 'church ceremony, as the only means of obtaining a legal marriage.' And is not the clergyman also compelled to submit to the use of that ceremony? How preposterous, then, when all are subject to the same compulsion, for one to protest to another, of an obligation which is not of *his* imposing to

whom the protest is offered; but by which, whether with or against his will, he is equally bound with the author of the protest. Having said thus much on the *rationale* of the subject, we must add, that we cannot excuse the clergyman for any rudeness in his manner of rejecting the foolish protest, or for any needless menace of legal constraint."

There appeared, in answer to the above article, some very spirited and just observations from the Editor of the Globe and Traveller, evening paper, of the same day; and, on the 17th instant, the following official paper, from our body, was published in the Times.

"THE ELDERS AND DEACONS of the London branch of the church of God, commonly known as FREETHINKING CHRISTIANS, having observed that the late conduct of two of their members, in protesting against the marriage ceremony, has exposed them to the marked animadversions of a leading daily journal, feel themselves called upon, through the same medium, to submit to the public the grounds and reasons of their conduct.

"MARRIAGE is regarded by the law of England, and it is held by the Freethinking Christian, to be a *civil* contract; and even if the language of the liturgy be adopted, which represents matrimony as 'instituted of God in the time of man's first innocency,' it is certain that marriage must *then* have been performed without the intervention of a priest.

"If in the progress of society it has been thought necessary to superadd a religious solemnization to marriage, in order to increase the sanctions of that state, the very reasons which superinduce such necessity must be defeated unless the solemnization be consistent with the conscience, and accordant with the faith of those who are to be bound thereby.

"By a comparatively recent act of parliament, (26 Geo. II. cap. 33) a submission to the marriage ceremony, as performed by the church of England, was, for the *first* time, imposed on all who sought to obtain a legal sanction to marriage, Jews and Quakers alone excepted.

"Derived chiefly from the Roman ritual and mass books, the marriage ceremony of the church of England appears to the Freethinking Christian to be popish in its doctrines; superstitious in its forms; and unsuited in its terms to the refinement of the age, or the occasion on which it is used.

"Bound in all things by the authority of scripture, and the dictates of conscience, the Freethinking Christian refuses to yield a voluntary submission to the marriage service, which, if the above representation be correct, it is difficult to suppose can be approved by any serious, well-informed Protestant. The objections of the Freethinking Christian, however, to this service, may be categorically stated as follows:—

"BECAUSE that service is part and parcel of the religion of the *state*, and must, as such and of consequence, be opposed to the religion of Jesus.

"BECAUSE it is not a service enjoined in the scriptures, but is an assertion only of the unscriptural claims of the church to decree rites and ceremonies.

"BECAUSE the service implies a recognition of the doctrine of the Trinity, and directs divine honours to 'the MAN Christ Jesus.'

"BECAUSE performed as a religious service, by a person 'in pretended holy orders,' it carries with it an admission of the claims of the priesthood; which claims, whether to be regarded as a separate body among Christians, as the ministers of Christ, or the exclusive teachers of religion, are unfounded in Christianity.

"BECAUSE it is a public outward act of joint and social prayer, and as

such is contrary to the spirituality of the Christian religion, and the instructions of him who taught his disciples to pray in secret to their Father.

"BECAUSE no earthly tribunal can possess the right to propose a *test* for religious opinion, much less to render the violation of conscience the condition of obtaining a *civil* right.

"BECAUSE, in several particulars, it is not accordant with that purity of mind which should at all times characterize the Christian.

"With these objections to the marriage ceremony, as imposed upon him by the law, the Freethinking Christian offers his protest against that ceremony, or rather against a forced recognition of that ceremony in his instance. He disclaims all belief in the doctrines he is compelled to subscribe; he declares it is by an act of compulsive conformity alone, that his submission is obtained to the forms of the church; he disowns the sacred functions of the minister about to perform the service; and he purges his conscience from all assent to unchristian doctrines and practices, both in the sight of God and of man.

"This protest he delivers publicly, *in* the church, *before* the 'altar,' and *to* the minister. Publicly—because the ceremony is public. In the church—because in the church he is compelled to submit to such ceremony. Before the 'alar'—because before the 'altar' he is required to yield an especial homage. To the minister—because the minister is the legal, the immediate, and willing agent in performing a service which, under the circumstances, must be held to be as great an infraction of conscience as it is a profanation of religion.

"The Freethinking Christian then, according to his apprehension, delivers his protest at the time, in the place, and to the party—when, where, and to whom it is most suitable to be delivered; and this in a manner and under circumstances in which it is most likely to prove effective: *first*, in satisfying his own conscience; and, *second*, in upholding to the world the wickedness, to the legislature the injustice, and to the church the inconvenience, of obtaining a *forced* conformity to established doctrines.

"Other and concurrent efforts have been used by the Freethinking Christians, to assert in this particular, the rights of conscience. They have been the first religious body who, by means of the press, have called the attention of dissenters to this important subject; and for many years past, and on several occasions, they have, in common with the Unitarian body, petitioned both Houses of Parliament for relief.

"Thus *petitioning* the legislature as the framers of an obnoxious law, and *protesting* to the clergy as the executors of such law, have the Freethinking Christians proceeded. They are, indeed, aware that when the law is opposed to conscience, no course can be wholly free from objection; but they submit that it is not for those who inflict a wrong to complain of the manner in which it is either received or resisted.

"It is not denied that the presenting of protests, according to the practice of the Freethinking Christians, must be painful to the clergy; but the inconvenience is one occasioned by the law, and the clergyman is a willing instrument of the law. He takes upon himself priest's orders—he enjoys the honours and emoluments of his calling—and shall he refuse to take the burden with the benefit, when he offers himself as the instrument of power to violate the rights of conscience? It results also from this statement of the case, that it is by a sophism only that the situation of him who perform the ceremony can be held, to be the same as that of the party to whom it is administered; for it is really distinguished therefrom by all the difference between *voluntary acceptance* and *compulsory submission*.

"It is asked, 'what have the clergy of the established church to do with

protests of this nature? Or where is the acceptance of them enjoined as part of their duty?' The question is invidious to the clergy, and can only be raised upon the presumption of their being the passive instruments of arbitrary power; or, hirelings caring not for the flock. For if the clergy of the church of England be, as they profess to be, the servants of Christ;—if they hold, as they profess to hold, religion to be a sacred affair between man and his Maker;—if they honour, as they profess to honour, the principles of the Reformation which overthrew the dominion of law over conscience;—then by the meekness and gentleness of Christ—by all that is sacred in religion—by whatever was great and glorious in the example of our reformers—are they bound to receive every declaration by which conscience shall assert its rights, and religion maintain its consistency.

"It is said that 'It would be quite as rational in the clergyman to give the couple a protest on account of their faith, as for them to give him one on account of a rite contained in the Book of Common Prayer.' Perhaps it would: only it should seem the clergyman is more willing to commit his conscience to the keeping of the state, than the Freethinking Christian is disposed to do; otherwise, indeed, there seems no reason why the clergyman should not protest to the dissenter against being considered a willing party to so indecent a mockery of religion, as the performance of a solemn ceremony to those who have openly and beforehand repudiated its sanctions, denounced its minister, and denied its doctrines!

"Such protests on the part of the clergy, if accompanied by petitions to the legislature, would tend speedily to relieve themselves from a painful duty, and dissenters from a degrading submission. At present, however, the clergy have neither protested nor petitioned; but they have, by an overwhelming opposition, during the last session of parliament, defeated that measure of relief by which it was proposed to make the church respectable and the dissenters free.

"It is part of the case of the dissenters that the evil originated with, and is now upheld by THE CHURCH. A corrupt pontiff, *mis*named *Innocent*, (the third) first rendered marriage in the church *compulsory*, and raised it to the rank of a *sacrament*. The reformed church, through the terrors of the ecclesiastical courts, continues to assert the exclusive claim of solemnizing marriage. This claim was, for the first time, sanctioned by an act of parliament, in 1753. By the progress of opinion the law has become oppressive to dissenters; they have petitioned the legislature for relief, and *the clergy* have opposed their prayer. When, therefore, the dissenter protests to the clergy of a wrong, it is not without a sense that they have a corrupt interest in that wrong—that they are the cause of its continuance by being the obstacle to its removal.

"The church it is true has become tolerant; but when the dissenter calls to mind the enlightened declaration made by the prime minister of the crown, during the debate on the bill for giving relief to dissenters in this particular, that '*The argument for the principle of the bill was unanswerable, as long as Jews and Quakers were exempted from submission to the marriage service,*'—can he forget his lordship's too prompt and devout assurance to the reverend bench, that 'he was as the same time unwilling to do any thing which should not receive the approbation of the CHURCH.' To this statement then, that the clergy 'pledge themselves, and are solemnly bound at their ordination to comply with the liturgy of the church of England,' it should be added—but they have the power to obtain an alteration of the law, so as to dispense with this obligation with respect to the marriage of dissenters; and they will neither do so themselves, nor suffer others to do so.

"It manifests also little acquaintance with this subject to assert, that 'It is not optional with them (the clergy) to use or to omit, a part of any of the church ceremonies;' for it really is optional with them to do so. And it is

remarkable that the bishop of Worcester should, in the debate above noticed, have defended the principle of the bill which was designed to relieve the dissenter by omitting certain portions of the marriage service, by contending that it was only proposed to do that by law, which was already to a certain extent done in practice; for, said his lordship, '*Does not every body know that in large and populous parishes the marriage service is now considerably abridged?*'

"Upon the known and ancient custom of the clergy then, in omitting *some portions* of the marriage service, and in dispensing with *some* of the directions of the rubric, the dissenter prefers a claim to the minister that, in administering the law, he will relieve him as far as may be—that he will do that for *conscience*, which he does not hesitate to do for *convenience*.

"So far, also, is it from being the case that the Freethinking Christian would feel his marriage invalidated by the omission of such parts of the ceremony as violate his conscience—that he really offers his protest in the hope of obtaining such; and that he has in some instances positively and successfully refused to kneel before the altar, or to repeat the names of the persons of the Trinity.

"Not that the Freethinking Christians will be contented to receive that relief at the discretion of the clergy, which they are entitled to claim from the justice of the legislature—nor will they believe that relief can be long delayed, when the principle upon which it is demanded was recognized by the Marriage Act itself, in exempting Jews and Quakers from its operation, and in not being extended to Scotland—when it has since been admitted by the Irish parliament, in the act passed to allow the dissenters of the sister kingdom to marry according to their own forms—and when it was, last sessions of parliament, advocated by the most distinguished members of the state, the chief ministers of the crown, and by some even of the dignitaries of the church.

(Signed) "J. Dillon, *Elder*.
"D. Harwood,
"J. Kilner,
"R. Hovendon,
"J. Denman." } *Deacons*.

The Times, without attempting to establish any one of the objections it had originally taken to the conduct of our friends, in protesting against the marriage ceremony, replied to the above statement of our case, in the following loose and random strain of animadversion.

"We insert an instrument of considerable length, signed by some of the chiefs of the sect of 'Freethinking Christians,' in reply to some observations we made on a protest offered by 'a couple' of that sect, at their marriage according to the forms of the church of England. If the law of the land, or the ceremonies of the church, were to be altered to please the fantasy of every innovator in politics or sceptic in religion, nothing permanent or comprehensive could be established. The ritual of the church of England was made to correspond, by the wisest, the most discreet, and the most pious men that ever lived, with the belief of the majority. It cannot be made to adapt itself to the faith of a thousand different sects, or perhaps to the peculiar tenets of every individual man; for we very much doubt, whether any two members, even of this sect of Freethinking Christians, think alike upon all religious topics. Indeed, what use is there in freethinking, if they cannot be free enough to think differently from every body else, and from each other? The followers of JOHANNA SOUTHCOTT, who, we believe, are at this moment more numerous than the Freethinking Christians, would not be content with any marriage ceremony in which the name of their

saint, and an allusion to her miraculous conception, should be omitted. This scruple must be indulged also, no doubt!

"It is remarkable that the authors and attestors of the document which we publish to day, though the very *leaders* of the sect of Freethinking Christians, know so little of that ceremony against which they protest, that they suppose that the couple to be married have to repeat the names of the persons in the Trinity. The document says that the Freethinking Christian 'has in some instances positively and successfully refused to kneel before the altar, and *to repeat the names of the persons in the Trinity.*' If this is the chief relief they want, then—to be excused from repeating 'the names of the persons in the Trinity'—we are sure that there is not a clergyman of the church of England who will not readily grant it to them. He will excuse *them* from repeating those names, if they will allow *him* to repeat them; and if they will not so allow him, it must be a pretty spirit of toleration by which they are actuated! If, also, they will not pray themselves, they may surely kneel while he prays; (we would not use an irrevelent illustration; but) as men who have no appetite sit at table for the sake of courtesy with those that eat.

"But farther: if the Freethinking Christians believe marriage to be only a civil contract, why do they not contract it among themselves by civil forms? Why do they obtrude their remonstrances on the church? It may be said, because the children of such marriages would, in the eye of the law, be illigitimate, and incapable of succeeding. And how many entailed estates do all the members of the sect of Freethinking Christians possess? How much property that they cannot bequeath by will? Let replies to these questions be inserted in their next petition to the legislature. And it is under this form, in truth, that relief should be granted to them—that after a civil contract with penalties, the sexes may cohabit, and that the offspring of such unions shall inherit, if there is any patrimony, as if the parties had solemnly plighted their faith at the altar."

The above reflections of the Editor shewed so little acquaintance with the offices of the church, of which he professes to be so zealous a supporter—they manifested such a general ignorance of the merits of the question in debate—and were, withall, written in a style of frivolity so little suited to the occasion, that we were of opinion, it would have been undignified on our part to pursue the subject further, with such an opponent. Here, therefore, the matter would have rested, had it not been taken up by a correspondent of the Times, of whom we have no sort of knowledge, but whose judicious and sensible letter, which appeared in the Times, Dec. 25, will best speak for itself.

"To the Editor of the Times.

"SIR,—Though I have no connexion of any sort with the people called 'Freethinking Christians,' yet I cannot deny that I had great pleasure in reading, in your paper of the 17th instant, an exposition of their views of the case of 'Dissenters' Marriages,' authenticated by the signatures of their Elder and Deacons, which appeared to me to be drawn up with great ability, and to exhibit a very clear and precise statement of the whole subject. In proportion, however, to the satisfaction derived from this well-written document, was my disappointment and regret at finding in the same paper some strictures upon

it, which, though purporting to come from the pen of the Editor, seem to be so much at variance with the liberal character of your journal, that I fully expected they would be immediately noticed by the parties concerned; but as this has not yet been the case, I trust you will not refuse admission to a few observations on them from an impartial observer.

"In the first place, Sir, I might ask you whether it is quite consistent with candour to call those persons 'sceptics on religion,' who profess, in this very paper on which you are remarking, to be 'bound in all things by the authority of scripture?' I might ask further—how does it appear that the ritual of the church of England 'was made to correspond with the belief of the majority,' it being well known that the public worship was, in the course of a few years, first Popish—then Protestant—then Popish—then Protestant again; and that the tyrants by whom these violent changes were made, had chiefly in view the maintenance of their own authority, without the least regard to the opinions of the people? But, passing by these minor points, I proceed to observe, that in representing the question to be whether 'the ceremonies of the church are to be altered to please the fantasy of every innovator,' you seem to me totally to mis-state the subject. Neither the 'Freethinking Christians,' nor any of the 'thousand different sects,' to whom you allude, are at all anxious to make any alteration at all in those ceremonies; and the members of the church may, if they like them, continue, without any disturbance from dissenters, to enjoy them to their hearts' content to the end of time. The real question is, whether 'the majority'—supposing it to be really such, which in this case is very doubtful—can, consistently with common justice and common sense, compel the minority to submit to the alternative of either joining in a ceremony at which their consciences revolt, or of foregoing the enjoyments of the rights of human nature. Now to this question the Freethinking Christians, without hesitation, answer No; and to this answer, I should think, every rational and impartial man must give his assent, especially when it is considered that the marriage contract, though unquestionably of high importance, is in reality altogether a civil one, and in its nature no more a part of religion than the indentures of an apprentice, or a contract of partnership between two traders.

"May I be allowed, Sir, without offence, to say, that the hint you gave them about cohabiting without any legal marriage, is open to such obvious and manifold objections, that I presume it must have been very hastily written and I have no doubt you now wish it had never been committed to paper.

"But this is not the only part of your strictures which bears marks of haste; there is another part which perfectly astonishes me—I mean where you seem to think you have convicted the Freethinking Christians of a blunder, in supposing that persons to be married have to repeat the names of the persons in the Trinity. You tell them, that the clergyman 'will excuse *them* from repeating them, if they will allow *him* to repeat them.' Now, Sir, if you will take the trouble to look into your Prayer Book, you will find that every man at his marriage is under the necessity of repeating after the priest the following words:—'With this ring I thee wed; with my body I thee worship; and with all my worldly goods I the endow—in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.' Now, Sir, if these denominations do not mean the persons who are, presently after, called 'God the Father, God the Son, God the Holy Ghost'—in other words, if they are not the names of what are usually called the three Persons in the Trinity, then I shall be glad to be informed by you what they do mean.

W. S."

* Regent's Park, Dec. 21.

To this letter the Times, thus convicted of carelessness and ignorance, offered the following explanation; the subdued tone of which must, as we conceive, be deemed far more fitting the occasion and the subject, than the presuming and oracular style it had heretofore assumed.

"We insert a letter on the subject of dissenting marriages, signed 'W. S.' the best of many we have received, chiefly for the purpose of noticing an error of our own. It is certain that in looking over the ceremony, the passage cited in the letter somehow or other escaped our notice; and observing only the other passage in which the priest pronounces the couple 'man and wife, in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost,' we too hastily concluded that *that* was the only passage in which the persons of the Trinity were introduced. The other parts of the letter we leave to work what good or harm it may to the cause which it espouses.

☞ The above article was concluded, and in the press, before any proceedings had been taken in the present session of Parliament, with regard to Dissenters' Marriages; the reader is therefore referred to the *supplemental article*, in the present number, for the notice of the recent proceedings in Parliament upon this subject.

A FATHER'S PRAYER.

SLEEP, lovely one! beside thy peaceful bed
A father prays for blessings on thine head.
The world shut out, to the propitious skies,
Oh! may a father's prayers prevailing rise!
Mays't thou be blest, my child! The dawn that beams
In thy young glance is sweet:—may living streams
Of heavenly light around thy manhood play,
And bless thee with a bright and glorious day!
May'st thou be blest, my child! Not what the vain
Call blessing when they wealth or greatness gain,—
Not as the high, the proud—on earth the worst,
With all the objects of their craving curst;—
But virtuous, honest, pious, just, and true,
These be the riches heaven reserves for you.
Firm to contend, but patient to endure,
May thy right hand be strong, thine heart be pure.
A mind as strong as upright may'st thou claim,
As marks my friend's, my father's honoured name.
May'st thou—as happy in the nuptual vow—
Rejoice in *thy* young race—as I do now.
May'st thou be blest, my child! When fear alarms,
Thy refuge now is, a fond father's arms.
When joy makes light thy footsteps, thou dost roam
But to return more fondly to that home,
And with endearing innocence entwine,
Thy playful limbs—thy happy heart with mine.
More warm—more pure—more sacred be the part,
That cheers and animates thy *manly* heart!
A safer refuge—holier home be given,
When thy young thoughts expand from earth to heaven.
Then may'st thou breathe, amid devotion's flame,
A name thine infant lips have ne'er presumed to name!

ON RELIGIOUS WORSHIP.—Essay viii.

THE SYNAGOGUE WORSHIP.—GENERAL VIEW.

"What is man?
Where must he find his Maker? with what rites
Adore him? Will he hear, accept, and bless?
Or does he sit regardless of his works?
—'Tis Revelation satisfies all doubts."—*Cowper's Task, Book II.*

From the first number of our Register, we have been engaged in proving that the modern practice of public social prayer is unsupported by scripture. The seventh essay (p. 254) only brought up the question to an examination of the worship of the Jewish temple; an examination of the remaining parts of the subject, conducted on the same *scale*, would evidently have occupied *many* succeeding essays; the close of our Work at this time compels us to compress what we have to say into *one* essay. To do this, we have of course abridged much and omitted much; we do not pretend, indeed, in this number, to give more than an outline of our argument; having discussed at length the early part of the subject, our object now is to give the *clue* only to the remaining part. The honest mind, which values truth sufficiently to *labour* after it, will feel a motive to follow the clue which we have afforded. We seek the approbation of, and have ourselves laboured for, none other. Having, in our former essays, entered on a part of the argument as to social prayer, hitherto but little entered upon, namely, the evidence of the *Old* Testament, and the practice of the Jewish people, we have, in the early part of this essay, endeavoured, on nearly the same scale, to complete *that* part of the subject. What follows as to the teaching of Jesus, the principles of Christianity, and the *general* view of the question, is in the abridged form explained above, and *as* an abridgment must be regarded by the reader.

Turning, then, to the practice of the Jewish people, we have seen, in the former essays, that the priests were appointed to sacrifice, the levites to sing, and that the people prayed individually, not socially, in the outer court of the Jewish temple. Pursuing yet further a negative of argument, it will be found—not only that prayer *was* not—but that it *could* not—have been practised in the temple. In support of this, we may refer, first, to the description of the temple and its courts; and, secondly, to that of the duties of all the officers: and these descriptions we will take—not only from the scriptures—but even from the writings of the very men who advocate the practice of social prayer. From these we shall see that there was no *place* for public social prayer, and no *person* by whom it could have been conducted or administered. First, For descriptions of the objects and contents of the temple, see 1 Kings vi. and vii.; 2 Chron. ii. to v.; and, in illustration, Ezek. xl. The temple, both as a whole, and in all its parts, is here described, and there *is no* PLACE *appointed for social prayer*. Consult also Godwyn's Moses and Aaron, book ii. chap. 1; Jennyngs's Hebrew Antiquities, book ii. chap. 1; Lewis's Origines Hebreæ, book iii. chap. 10 to 18; Fleury's Short History of the Israelites, part ii. chap. 16. These works, often quoted in favour of social prayer, contain plain and, in some of the cases, minute descriptions of the temple and all its parts, *and yet there is no one spot which either of them appropriates to the social prayer of the Jewish people.**

* Lewis occupies *many* chapters in describing the temple, and the objects of its various parts, and names no place appointed for the social prayer of the people; in a subsequent part of the work, whilst describing the process of sacrificing, he incidentally says—"and now they" (the priests) "go into the room Gazith, which they used as an oratory for public prayer." B. iv. chap. 13; see also Lightfoot's Temple Service, chap. ix. § 4. For this assertion, or for the very existence of the room, called Gazith, at all, Lewis produces no authority whatever. The service of the temple was national, and intended for the whole Jewish people; how can we believe then, that its prayer, if social, would have been confined to "*a room?*" and that too a room *not mentioned or even alluded to in scripture?* When we call for cases from the scriptures of social prayer, we are told, as a reason for the paucity of evidence, that the thing was of too common occurrence to be recorded; how is it then that Lewis has learned the very *name* of the room in which the Jewish priests prayed socially? Where and why has *that name* been recorded? But our chief object now is to point out that this writer, who professes to be acquainted with the very name of "the room" in which the Jewish priests prayed, yet in a long and minute description of the temple, has discovered no place intended for, or appropriated to the social prayer of the Jewish people; nay, has in the same volume acknowledged (b. iv. chap. 1) that "*under the temple the people were usually left to their own conceptions.*" Is not this to give up the whole question? for if the people were left "to their own conceptions" how could they practice *social* prayer?

We turn to the OFFICERS of the temple. The duties of *all* those officers are described, yet *no one* of them is appointed to social prayer. First, The *priests;* see their duties stated, Numb. iv. 16, vi. 23; 1 Sam. ii. 27; 1 Chron. vi. 48, xvi., xxiii. 13; 2 Chron. xxix.; Heb. viii. 3. See on this subject, Godwyn, book i. chap. 5; Jennings, book i. chap. 5; Lewis, book ii. chap. 1 to 8; Croxall, Scripture Politics, chap. 7. Secondly, The *levites;* for their duties, see Numb, i. 50, iii. 6—18—39, the whole of chapter four; viii. 9; Deut. x. 8; 1 Chron. vi. 31, ix. 32, xv. 2—16, xvi. 1, xxiii. 3. Consult also the same authors, as under the head priests. The only remaining officers of the temple, sanctioned by the scriptures, are, Thirdly, The *Nethenims,* "the hewers of wood and drawers of water." See Deut. xxix. 11; Neh. vii. 46; and also consult the authors above quoted. In these passages, and in these writers, will be found, described at length, the offices and duties of the priests, the levites, and the nethenims; and *they none of them include social prayer, or the conducting the prayer of the people, among the number of those offices or duties.* We do not say, for ourselves, that these writers (Godwyn, Lewis, &c.) are authorities on the subject, for we think the scriptures the best, if not the only, authority; but as these writers are *constantly* quoted by others, in support of social prayer, we refer to them, and find that, *on their own shewing,* it never could have been practised in the Jewish temple; for that there was no officer appointed to lead in, or administer it. Besides the above, these writers cite *other* officers, *not* named by the scriptures, and chiefly quoted on rabbinical authority. See, particularly, Lightfoot on the Temple Service, chap. iii. sec. 8; Godwyn, &c. as above; and Prideaux, part 1. b. vi. Here we find officers named Sagan, two called Katholikin, seven called Immarkalin, various stationary men, and fifteen species of overseers for various purposes; *but no one of these officers, and indeed no officer whatever, appointed for public social prayer.** We infer, then, that, in the Jewish temple,

* Lightfoot, from the stores of whose rabbinical learning all subsequent writers on Jewish subjects have borrowed largely, for the interests of truth perhaps too largely, describes, in his treatise entitled "Temple Worship," the duties of the high priest and priest, in which duties *social* prayer are *not* included. He then, upon rabbinical, *not* scriptural authority, goes on to describe the other officers of the Temple, but not one of these are described as employed in social prayer. *Sagan,* he says, was undoubtedly next to the high priest, and vicegerent to him. Of the *Katholikin* there were two; their office was uncertain, but it is supposed that they had the care of the treasury. The *Immarkalin* were seven, in whose keeping were the seven keys of the gates of the court. There were also the *Gizbaren* who were substitutes for the *Immarkalin.*

even on the shewing of the advocates of social prayer—THERE WAS NO PLACE FOR IT, AND NO PERSON BY WHOM IT COULD HAVE BEEN CONDUCTED OR ADMINISTERED.

Another accumulative species of proof may be adduced to the same effect. If the Jews, as is asserted, regularly practised social prayer, they must have practised it on great and solemn occasions, particularly on their sabbaths, feasts,

---

Lightfoot also, on the authority of the Talmud and of Maimonides, informs us that there were fifteen kinds of overseers in the Temple, and thus describes their offices and occupations.

1 An overseer concerning the times (of commencing).
2 ..... for shutting the doors.
3 ..... of the guards.
4 ..... of the singers.
5 ..... of the cymbal music.
6 ..... of the lots.
7 ..... about birds.
8 ..... of the seals.
9 ..... of the drink offerings.
10 ..... of the sick.
11 ..... of the waters.
12 ..... of making the shew bread.
13 ..... of making the incense.
14 ..... of the workmen that made the veils.
15 ..... for providing the garments of the priests.

While then there were overseers for all these purposes, how did it happen that there were none for social prayer? The singers, the cymbal music, &c. were thus watched and provided for—why not those who led the *prayers* of the people? Neither from scripture then, nor from the rabbinical writers, nor from the modern defenders of the practice, is there evidence that there was any officer employed in the temple for that purpose. Among the officers of the Jewish temple, it is asserted that there were men called "*men of the station.*" "PERHAPS (Mr. Moore says) the Israelites of the station were considered as leaders of the devotions of the people." For this office, and its supposed duties, see Godwyn, book i. chap. 5; Lightfoot's Temple Service, chap. vii. sec. 3; Lewis, book ii. chap. 14; Prideaux, vol. i. page 382; Pope, page 45; Moore, page 45 and 58. This office *all* these authorities agree, *is unknown to the scriptures.* The words of Lightfoot are emphatic:—"this, indeed, is a title that is *strange* to the scriptures." Yet upon this *strange* title, Moore and others build one of their chief arguments in favour of social prayer. The matter is put thus: The law required that those who offered sacrifices should be present at them. As all the people could not be present at the national sacrifices, it is *inferred* that they *stood* there (hence the term *stationary* men) by their representatives. Moore goes yet further: *asserting* that it was the duty of the people to be present at social prayer in the temple; he then *assumes* that, in prayer too, as before it was assumed with regard to sacrifices, these stationary men were the proxies, or representatives, of the nation. The absurdity of this conclusion, founded as it is too on a long string of unproved assumptions, Mr. Moore himself feels. "With the absurdity of worshipping God by proxy, (he adds) whether by Jews or others, our argument has no concern; but the constant attendance of these representatives of the people, *who were necessarily absent,* is by no means irrelevant." And he immediately adds an inference from this circumstance, that "the whole services of the temple were *strictly social.*" The sociality of prayer, the people who joined in which were *absent,* would rather appear to involve an Irishism.

&c. We turn to these in the scriptures, and find no mention whatever made in connexion with these of social prayer. Judging by our experience in our own times, *these* are the occasions on which social prayer, if at all practised, would have been most insisted on, and in which we should have found it most frequently mentioned. That it is *not* so named in cases where, if at all practised, it would have been practised, the following, amongst other cases, will prove.* We direct the reader's attention to these as affording *incidental* evidence—that social prayer was *not* practised by the Jewish people.

Social prayer, then, is NOT named among the ceremonies, &c. which are made conditions of the covenant through Moses, see Exod. xxxiv. 10 to 28, and Deut. xxvii. 2.—It forms no part of the duties or employment of the sabbath, Exod. xx. 8; Deut. v. 13; Numb. xxviii. 9.—Of the sabbath of years, Lev. xxv. 1; Exod. xxiii. 10.—Of the year of jubilee, Lev. xxv. 8. It is *not* enjoined at the institution of the passover, Exod. xii. 18; Lev. xxiii. 5; Numb. xxviii. 16. —Of the feast of tabernacles, Lev. xxiii. 33; Deut. xvi. 13; Numb. xxix. 13.—Of the feast of trumpets, Lev. xxiii. 23; Numb. viii. 10, xxix. 1. Of the feast of Pentecost, Lev. xxiii. 15.—Of the feast of weeks, Deut. xvi. 9.—Of the day of first fruits, Numb. xxviii. 26.—Of the day called that of afflicting their souls, Numb. xxix. 7.—Of the feast of the new

---

* Moore and other writers in defence of social prayer, frequently argue (by a new species of logic), that the Jews must have been in the constant habit of social prayer, *because* their writers are silent upon the subject—upon the principle that historians only record peculiar events and not every day occurrences. On this principle we might apply to them the old distitch—

> "My *proof*'s so great because it is so small—
> It had been greater were it none at all."

But how is this mode of argument reconcilable with their producing many passages which *they say* plainly speak of, and fully establish the practice? The fact is, that Jewish writers *are* silent on the subject, and they *could not* have been silent on a practice which, had it existed, must have been expressly enjoined as a part of their public law, and which, by its frequent repetition, would have been mixed up with all their public, and most of their individual transactions. Sacrifice affords a good illustration of this position; *that* was an every day practice, and yet of that we find constant mention. But even if this argument should be deemed applicable to the historical part of the scriptures, what shall we say to what may be called the ceremonial part? When forms and set days are appointed, and certain observances commanded, it cannot *then* be said that mention would not be made of a certain ceremony *because* it was common. Who could describe a modern *Sunday* in a church or chapel and omit social prayer, common as it may be? The reader may see in the text the number of days, &c. appointed with sacrifice, &c. and in which social prayer is never once named, and he may judge for himself whether it is likely that social prayer was practised.

moon, Numb. xxviii. 11. In a word, taking separately each and all of the feasts and ceremonies of the Jewish people, as appointed by Jehovah, we shall find sacrifices and other rites constantly spoken of; *but no one mention of, or allusion to, public social prayer*. The seven first chapters of Leviticus (besides many other passages) contain minute and particular directions as to the mode, time, and place of sacrifice;—the directions for various observances, national and individual; for vows and free-will offerings, for first fruits, for tithes, for feasts, for fasts, &c. are almost without number; whilst there is not *even a single passage* which contains a direction as to the mode, time, or place of social prayer.* There are cases provided for in the Jewish law, and circumstances occurring in the Jewish history, in which, if *ever* practised, social prayer *must* have occurred, and yet we find no mention of it. It is *not* enjoined on those who vowed the vow of a Nazarene—Numb. vi. 13; it is *not* named in connexion with cleansing in cases of leprosy—Ex. xiv. 15: or with the cleansings from legal pollution named in various parts of the Jewish law. Social prayer is *not* named at the dedication of the tabernacle—Ex. lx.; at the consecration of Aaron and his sons Lev. viii.;—at the bringing of the ark into the temple 1 Kings viii. 6;—at the dedication of the temple by Solomon, 1 Kings viii.;†—at the repairing of the temple by Joash, 2 Chron. xxiv.;—at its reopening by Hezekiah;—at the great passover kept by Josiah 2 Chron. xxxv. 15;‡—at the septennial reading of the law Deut. xxxi. 10; or, finally, at the renewal of the covenant on the return from Babylon, described in Neh. x. 28. We submit to every rational and candid mind, if there is not here presented a *mass* of occasions, on which the *non*-appointment of social

---

* The social prayers of the Jewish synagogue, with directions for their use, in the present day, occupy *six* octavo volumes—how is it that their early writings contain not a single direction for, and not a single allusion to, such a practice?

† See page 258 of this volume.

‡ The attention of the reader is particularly called to this passage, as containing a more than usually *minute* description of a religious celebration of the Jewish nation; "there was," it is said, "no passover like it from the days of Samuel," and all its observances are described. "The priests stood in their places, and the levites in their courses," (v. 10.) but the priests were employed—*not in social prayer*, as the modern self-called priests employ themselves, but in sacrifice; and, for the levites, they assisted the priests in the sacrifices, and "the singers were in their place, (v. 15.) and the porters waited at every gate." "*So* (it is added, v. 16.) ALL *the service of the Lord was prepared the same day, to keep the passover and to offer burnt offerings upon the altar of the Lord.*" We remark then, that ALL the service did *not* include social prayer

prayer amounts to a proof, as strong as any merely negative proof can be—that social prayer was not commanded to, or practised by, the Jewish people.

Social prayer, if commanded to the Jews, must have been practised by some of them; yet none are praised for its observance. It must have been neglected by some, yet none are censured for its omission. Of all observances, it is the one the most likely to degenerate into mere formality, and to become abused; yet no one (as in the case of sacrifices, feasts, new moons, &c.) is censured for such degeneracy, or called to account for such abuse. *We infer, then, that social prayer was neither enjoined to, nor practised by, the Jewish people.*

The MANNERS AND CUSTOMS of the Jews should be borne in mind, as explanatory of various passages of scripture which have mistakenly been adduced in favour of social prayer. The language of all primitive nations has been poetical; and the personal manners of all eastern countries are more vehement, expressive, and demonstrative than those of colder climates. Songs have been amongst the earliest historical records of most nations; they were such, amongst others, with the Jewish people,* and religion being with them connected with civil policy, *their* songs or hymns assumed a more decidedly religious character than those of other nations. What they felt with force they ex-

* "Their parables are commonly expressed in verse, and the verses are made to be sung, for which reason I believe that the Israelites learned music too. I judge of them by the Greeks, who had all their learning and politeness from the people of the east. Now it is certain that the Greeks taught their children both to sing and to play upon instruments. This study is the most ancient of all others. Before the use of letters the memory of great actions was preserved by songs. The Gauls and Germans retained the same custom in the times of the Romans, and it is still fully preserved amongst the natives of America. Though the Hebrews had letters, they knew that words in measure and set to a tune were always best remembered, and hence proceeded that great care which they always took to compose songs upon any important event that had happened to them." *Abbé Fleury's Short History of the Israelites*, part ii. ch. 11. The learned author then proceeds to cite as cases in point the two songs of Moses, that of Deborah, of Samuel's mother, many of the psalms, &c. adding—"Thus the most important truths and exalted notions were agreably instilled into the minds of children by poetry set to music;"—but this it will be observed was not prayer at all, and therefore could not have been *public social* prayer. This is the case even when these compositions assumed the form of request or petition. Our own national anthem, "*God save the King*," is a case in point. We have here throughout the form of petition, and that perhaps not very decorously expressed—"*Oh, Lord our God arise!*" &c. yet who that heard this sung in a convivial party, or at one of our national theatres, could adduce *that* as a case of social prayer, or *hence* draw a president in favour of its future practice some centuries afterwards by another nation?

pressed too with vigour;—in public, aloud, in the field, in the city, in the presence of their leaders, in the way of assent to their public speakers, crying—*amen, amen*—(truth, truth), dancing, shouting, singing; and, whether rejoicing or lamenting, expressing their feeling with loud voices, so that the noise could be "*heard afar off*." A few cases will illustrate these remarks. When delivered from the Egyptians, Moses burst forth into a song, which is succeeded by the women with music and dancing. (Ex. xv. 1.) Before his death, Moses describes, in metre, the mercy and vengeance of God. On the death of Sisera, the "avenging of Israel" is celebrated in like manner. (Judges v. 1.) At the removal of the ark, the king danced, and the people played on all manner of instruments, and shouted. (2 Sam. vi. 5—14.) Various songs or psalms of David are of this description. (See particularly 2 Sam. xxii.) Their going to battle was accompanied by their national songs, (2 Chro. xx. 21); and they returned victorious to Jerusalem, "with psalteries, and harps, and trumpets, into the house of the Lord," (v. 28.) "Praise the Lord," and other similar phrases, appear to have literally become "the burthen of their songs." In adversity too, and "by the waters of Babylon," they expressed their feelings in metre. Nor were these habits confined to national events,—they extended to individual occurrences, and to private life. Thus we have Hannah's "song of thankfulness," on the birth of her son. (2 Sam. ii. 1.) Hezekiah's song, on his recovery. (Ps. xxxviiii.) The lamentations of "the singing men and the singing women" for Josiah. To come down to a later period, the rejoicing of the whole multitude of the disciples, "praising God with a loud voice," on the entry of Jesus into Jerusalem, (Luke xix. 31) and the quotation of a psalm by the disciples, on the deliverance of Paul and John from prison, are cases of this description, as consistent with the manners of the Jewish people, as they are remote from those of our own time and country; *but these have nothing whatever to do with public social prayer*. This view of the manners of the Jewish people will explain many otherwise difficult passages, which are, by some, mistakenly supposed to support the practice of social prayer. We refer to those cases in which the whole assembled people are spoken of as bowing their heads, raising their hands, crying with a loud voice, shouting and worshipping; these are generally cases of pressing national danger, or the occurrence of some important political events. See Exod. iv. 31, xiv. 10, xxxiii. 10; Judges

x. 15; 2 Ch. vii. 3, xv. 14, xx. 18, Neh. v. 13, viii. 5; ix. 1, xii. 43. If these are examples to us in modern times at all, it must be in the way of precedent *for our national or political meetings;* but even this they cannot be until we are similarly circumstanced as a nation, to the Jewish people; till we are, or believe ourselves, as a nation, the favoured people of heaven, and regard the Deity as peculiarly and locally present amongst us.

THE JEWISH SYNAGOGUE.

Failing in the proof that social prayer was practised in the temple, or that it is enjoined in the scriptures, Moore, (Inquiry into the Scriptural Authority for Social Worship,) and other writers, maintain, that it was practised in the SYNAGOGUE; that the practice was there joined in and sanctioned by Jesus and his apostles; and that it is therefore imperative upon society at large in the present day. *All* these positions we negative as unfounded; but our limits will only allow us to *suggest,* rather than to enlarge, on the means of proving them so. A few references and quotations will inform our readers of the assertions made upon this subject by the advocates of social prayer.

Prideaux asserts, (p. i. book 6) That *prayers* formed part of the service of the synagogue: adding, "for their prayers they have liturgies, in which are all the prescribed forms of their synagogue worship; these at first were very few," &c. He then goes on, by reference to the *Mishnah,* &c. to support this assertion, in which he is blindly followed by almost every subsequent writer upon the subject of the synagogue worship. Among the officers of the synagogue, Lightfoot and other writers of rabbinical learning state that there was one called the angel, or messenger, whose office it was to offer up public prayers to God, for the whole congregation. "It is not possible (Moore asserts, 69) that any mode of prayer could be more completely *social* than that of the ancient synagogue;" "their liturgy was read aloud by one individual, and the "people signified their concurrence by responses through-"out," (80). He then gives, from Vitringa, a detailed account of the supposed *liturgy* of that period, (which, as he truly observes, bears a considerable resemblance to that of the established church) and thus concludes, (83) "*So perfectly* "*social then, was the mode of worship* WHICH CHRIST AND "HIS APOSTLES SANCTIONED BY THEIR REGULAR ATTEN-"DANCE UPON IT." "*So universal and so long established*

"*was the practice of social prayer in the habits of their coun-*
"*trymen, that it would never occur to them to give a particular*
"*command to enforce the obedience of it, as if it were something*
"*new or generally neglected.*"

Our hints for a reply to the above will be confined to three points. 1st. To maintain that the synagogue worship is no pattern for us to imitate. 2d. To prove, from Prideaux's own authorities, that he is not justified in his inferences. 3d. To shew, from the New Testament, that *social* prayer was *not* practised in the synagogue at that time, and that consequently Jesus and the apostles did *not* sanction it by their presence there. *First*, as to the *authority* of the synagogue service. It was a service *not* appointed by Deity. Synagogues, the best authorities agree, sprung up at or after the time of Ezra, on the return of the Jews from captivity, and were appointed, not for religious worship, but for *the reading of the law*.* They became at length spread over the land of Judea, and in all its cities. Some writers have contended, that the worship of the synagogue was superior to that of the temple, and that, unlike that of the latter, it was *not* abolished by Jesus. These assertions, however, confute themselves. If the worship enjoined by the Deity himself, in the Jewish age, is not imperative upon us, why should we submit to the will-worship of the scribes and the pharisees, and of the Jewish people? If the service of the temple, which God for wise, though temporary purposes, had established, was to be abolished, surely the forms of the synagogue, instituted by *man*, are not to be, *and for that very reason*, held forth to us as themes for our admiration, and patterns for our example!† We wholly deny, therefore, the authority of the

* The synagogue is no where mentioned in the Old Testament. Some, however, have supposed that they traced their existence in the early ages of the Jewish history, by the passage Ps. lxxiv. 8, (where, however, the word should be translated *assemblies*) and in Acts xv. 21. That there were no such synagogues may be directly inferred from 2 Kings xxii. 11; 2 Chron. xvii. 7, xxxiv. 14; and from their being no where appointed or commanded.

† Vitringa (in the true spirit of theorizing) has written to prove that the Jewish synagogue was the model of what he calls the Christian church. Pope, (Reply to Wakefield, p. 49) in commenting on the command of Jesus to his disciples, that they should not be like the hypocrites, who prayed in the synagogues, draws the singular conclusion—that Jesus did *not* disapprove of public social prayer there; and that "whatever parts of the Jewish institution did not fall under his censure, may be justly regarded as having his approbation." Moore argues that the synagogue worship is to be respected *more* than the temple worship, *because* the former was *not* of divine origin! "The Mosaic ritual, with all its expensive, troublesome ceremonies, and invidious distinctions, was abolished by Christianity altogether; the

synagogue; we assert that it affords for us no example or precedent whatever. Even, therefore, had social prayer been practised there, we should not, on that account, have regarded it as right in itself, or imperative on us. But we proceed to shew, *Secondly*, From *Prideaux's* authorities, (whom we name because he is quoted and followed by *all* the modern writers) that he is not justified in his position—that social prayer *was* practised in the synagogue at the time of Jesus; and that, consequently, all the inferences which he and others have drawn from that assumption, must fall to the ground as false and unfounded.

Prideaux *asserts* (Connection, vol. 1. p. 374) that liturgies were at this time used, and that the synagogue service was "*very long*." (397.) The most solemn part of their prayers were, he says, those called *Shemoneh Eshreh*, i. e. *the eighteen prayers*, which he quotes at length from the Jewish liturgies, citing Maimonides (a rabbinical writer of the eleventh century) as his authority. "These, (he adds) "*they say*," (that is, the Jews say) "were composed and in-"stituted by Ezra and the great synagogue. It is *certain* "these prayers are very ancient, FOR MENTION IS MADE OF "THEM IN THE MISHNAH, (in Barachoth, cap. iv. sec. 3) "as old settled forms; and no doubt is to be made but that "they were used in our Saviour's time, at least most of "them, if not all the eighteen, AND CONSEQUENTLY THAT "HE JOINED IN THEM WITH THE REST OF THE JEWS "*whenever he went into their synagogues, as he always did* "*every sabbath day*." Upon this single assertion *(that these eighteen prayers formed part of the social worship of the synagogue in the time of Christ)* rests the whole hypothesis of

---

devotional services of the synagogue, however, FORMED NO PART OF THIS RITUAL, and *to them accordingly* Christ makes no allusion in the passage under consideration." p. 100, (that of the woman of Samaria). Here is an avowal then—that the synagogue service *formed no part of the Mosaic ritual*;—it was the mere addition of man to the work of God; yet, in order to support his system of social prayer, Mr. Moore asserts, (139) that "the worship of the synagogue was MORE RATIONAL, CONDUCTED WITH GREATER SIMPLICITY, MORE LIBERAL, AND BETTER ADAPTED TO GENERAL USE THAN THAT OF THE TEMPLE!" For which reasons he states (67) that, "in the time of Christ, the worship of the synagogue may be said with propriety to have been *the national worship of the Jews*, MUCH MORE SO THAN EVEN THAT OF THE TEMPLE." This, at least, is honest, in so far as it is an avowal that the authority of those who, "by their traditions had made the word of God of no effect," is more regarded by these writers than the authority of revelation itself. We are content to leave to these men the practices of the synagogue, and the traditions of the rabbies; though still we must contend that social prayer was not, at the time of Jesus, included in the one, or, as far as evidence is left us on the subject, sanctioned by the other.

Prideaux and others—that Jesus sanctioned that practice by his presence. He quotes no other authority whatever to prove this point. *His whole case rests upon this one citation from the MISHNAH;*—he feels it indeed so important to his case, that he quotes the whole of these eighteen prayers at length, and occupies on this subject alone, *five* octavo pages. All subsequent writers have servilely copied Prideaux on this point, labouring this one point as conclusive and final on the subject; thus we find Moore also quoting these eighteen prayers at length, and occupying with them, and his inferences from them, no less than *ten* pages of his "Inquiry."

In reply then to this assumption of Prideaux we assert, First, That the Mishnah is no credible authority on this, or any other subject; and, Secondly, That, even if it were so, it does *not* prove the point in question, for that the passage cited by Prideaux has nothing whatever to do with *social* prayer—nay, that it proves, if it prove any thing, that the prayer at that time was *individual.*

First, *That the Mishnah is no credible authority.* We were prepared, somewhat in detail, to have given an account of the origin and contents of this work, but our abridged limits compel us to be brief. We have thrown into the form of a note some information upon this subject,* and for the *character* of

* The fullest information as to the account which the Jews themselves give of the origin and history of the Mishnah, will be found in a curious work, entitled "*A succint Account of the Duties, Rites, and Ceremonials of the Jews, by David Levi,*" under the head of "*The Mishnah, or the Oral Law and the Teachers thereof.*" The commandments given to Moses, we are here told, were accompanied by their proper *explanations*; thus, by "the law" given to Moses, (Ex. xxiv. 12) they understand the written law; by "the commandments," the oral law. The "book of the law" was written by Moses, (Deut. xxxi. 26) but the interpretation, they say, he did not write, but gave it in charge to the elders, and to Joshua and the rest of Israel, quoting the passage, "all the words which I *command* you, that shall ye take heed to do." These *commandments*, they contend, formed the oral law. The mode in which they say Moses taught this law is then described. Moses, on his return to his tent, delivered these interpretations, first to Aaron, who then sat down by Moses; then to Eleazer and Ithumar, his sons, who also seated themselves; the seventy elders then came in and heard the oral law; and, lastly, entered the people. Moses withdrawing, Aaron repeated what he had heard; his sons, and then the elders successively, repeated the same, and then withdrew; so that all heard this oral law four times repeated. Moses, it is added, repeated all the interpretations of the law before his death. (See Deut. i. 3.) Joshua is called "the *second* receiver of the oral law." The "*chain of receivers,*" as it is called, is then given at length and chronologically, through many links of judges, or prophets. The traditions, after the return of the Jews from captivity, fell into the hands of "*the Mishnical doctors.*" The rabbi "Judah Hakkadosh, or the *holy,*" was esteemed the forty-first receiver for Mount Sinai. He lived, this writer says, 100 years after the destruction of the temple. Finding those learned in the oral law to decrease, and fearing their extinction, he put into writing the oral traditions which had been

the work, and in evidence of its *credibility*, we shall cite one writer only—but he is one who will not be suspected of prejudice in favour of our views—namely, Mr. Moore himself. The Mishnah, then, he describes (Appendix, No. 1) as having been written by the Mishnical doctors, who first arose 292 years before Christ, who studied and descanted on the traditions received by the great synagogue, (and which it was *pretended* had been delivered *orally* by Moses) and who drew inferences and consequences from them, in which, being followed by others who succeeded them, "*they continually* (he says) *added their own imaginations to what they had received from those who went before them, whereby their traditions became* LIKE A GREAT SNOW-BALL, *the further they rolled from one generation to another, the more they gathered, and the greater the bulk of them grew.*" Towards the middle (some writers say at the end) of the *second* century, these traditions were first put into writing.* The

---

handed down, dividing them into six heads. This is the *Mishnah*, which was embraced by the nation as an authentic body of the oral law. Being delivered in aphorisms, it was thought to need explanations. Hence arose the Gamara, (or complement) which consist of comments on the Mishnah. The whole together is called the Talmud, and the authors thereof dictators. The nature and spirit of this laborious work may be inferred from one case cited by David Levi himself. The Talmud states that a long piece, or tongue, of scarlet, was fastened round the neck of the scape goat, and afterwards fastened to the gate of the temple; if the goat was dashed in pieces by falling over a certain precipice, the scarlet tongue turned white, although the distance was twelve miles. This, however, the Talmud teaches ceased after the death of Simon the Just. (Mishnah in Yuno.) A writer in the Universalist's Miscellany, (vol. iii. p. 185) who appears to have examined and properly appreciated the Talmud, on the authority of which Prideaux, Moore, and others build so much, thus sums up his opinions: "This work contains nothing that is valuable, but a very heavy load of pious absurdities, of inspired stories, and palpable contradictions." The value which the Jews have attributed to this compilation is extreme. "Do not think (says one of their writers) that the written law is the foundation, but rather the oral law." "When a man departs from the doctrines of the traditions to those of the Bible, then there is no longer any peace for him, since there is no demonstration in the doctrine of the Bible; it is the Mishnah which explains the secrets of holy writ." (Remarks on the Traditions of the Rabbins, by Christopher Lee, 12mo, London, 1815.) The rabbins compare the scriptures to water, the Mishnah to wine, and the Talmud to spiced wine. They tell us that of the twelve hours of the day, God employs nine to study the Talmud, and only three to read the written law! The reader will see in the text the use which has been made of this *valuable* work in favour of public social prayer!

* The *date* of this compilation is not without its importance, as Prideaux cites it as authority for what took place *in the time of Jesus*. Prideaux himself allows that it was not written till 150 years after Christ. Lightfoot says 190 years; others place it at 220. The "snow ball" of tradition had doubtless considerably increased in magnitude whilst rolling through this period of two centuries. Over the entrance to the temple, say the rabbins, was placed a cluster of grapes, carved and gilt; this constantly encreased in size by the never ceasing addition of golden grapes by all the visitors to the temple. The traditions of the elders were the

work has come down in this form to modern times, and is described by Mr. Moore himself in one place (p. 77, note) as "ABOUNDING IN FABULOUS AND PUERILE TRADITIONS;" and in another "AS CONTAINING A COLLECTION OF ABSURD AND FABULOUS TRADITIONS." "In a matter of "fact, however, like that of the antiquity of the eighteen "prayers, it is" (he asserts) "*an authority* PERFECTLY "*SATISFACTORY!*" So that the *fact*, that social prayer was practised in the Jewish synagogue, and the *inference* that Jesus sanctioned it by his presence, is after all founded upon the bare "*mention*," for that is Prideaux's expression, of eighteen prayers, in a work collected nearly two centuries after Jesus, and abounding, *on their own shewing*, in puerile, absurd, and fabulous traditions, which, like a snow-ball, had constantly increased as it rolled from one generation to another—and this evidence is described by the defenders of social prayer, as "*perfectly satisfactory*."

Secondly, Taking, however, the Mishnah as authority—*what does it prove on the present subject?* Prideaux, and others after him, state, "*that these eighteen prayers* ARE "*MENTIONED IN THE MISHNAH*" (in Barachoth, cap. 4, sec. 3) "*AS OLD SETTLED FORMS*." And by the word *form* is here evidently meant, *form* of synagogue worship; for it is added, as a *consequence*, that they were no doubt used in our Saviour's time;—"*CONSEQUENTLY, that he joined* "*in them with the rest of the Jews, whenever he went into the* "*synagogues*." It is not enough, then, for the purpose of Prideaux, that these prayers should be barely *mentioned*, nor is it enough that they should be mentioned generally as *settled forms;* they must be spoken of as settled forms of synagogue worship, or his *consequence* does not follow. On their being so mentioned the whole of our opponent's hypothesis depends. Of what then is it which this passage in the Mishnah really makes mention? The passage occurs in that portion of this work in which the traditions concerning *prayers* are recorded, and is, as literally translated as possible, as follows:—

Thirdly, "*Rabbi Gamaliel says, every man should pray* "*daily eighteen*" (prayers.) "*Rabbi Joshua says, one con-*

---

grape-vine, thus continually encreasing in its produce; and the lees of the intoxicating liquor which it produced, has descended to the *elders* of our own times who bow down to the authority of the Mishnah and the Gamara—who prefer Lightfoot to Jesus—and regard Moses Maimonides as higher authority than Moses, the law-giver.

"*taining eighteen*" (is sufficient.) "*Rabbi Akila says, if* "*his prayer is fluent in his mouth, he shall pray eighteen; if* "*not, one containing eighteen.*"* On this we observe three things—First, That it is not defined which are the eighteen prayers here referred to; they may, or they may not be, the identical prayers cited by Prideaux. Secondly, That they are *not*, as stated by Prideaux, "mentioned as old esta-"blished forms;" they *are* mentioned indeed, and from that circumstance an inference *may* be drawn, that they had been for some time known. Thirdly, Mention is here made of certain *eighteen* prayers, and also of *one* prayer, which appears to have been a summary or abridgement of the eighteen; and, on the authority of the rabbins named above, an *option* or *discretion* is left in the individual to use either the *eighteen* or the *one*—the whole or the abridgement—according to circumstances:—*the prayer then we infer must have been* INDIVIDUAL *prayer;* for in *social* prayer no such option could have been made, no such discretion could have been exercised. Was Rabbi Gamaliel speaking of the

---

* A gentleman of the Jewish nation, intimately acquainted with Hebrew literature, and himself a professor of languages, has politely furnished us with his rendering of the passage from the Mishnah and its context, with notes from the rabbins, and his own remarks on the subject. The passage occurs in the first book, called Barachoth, i.e. blessings, and may be taken as a sample of the whole. "Rabbi Nicenias, the son of Hakkana, used to pray when he went in and out of the college a short prayer; they said unto him what cause is there for a prayer? He said unto them, when I went I prayed that there should not occur any mischief through me," (by false teaching) "and when I came out I gave thanks for my portion.

"*Rabbi Gamaliel says, every man should pray daily eighteen prayers. Rabbi Joshua says one containing eighteen,*" (or a summary.) "*Rabbi Akila says, if his prayer is fluent in his mouth he shall pray eighteen, if not, one containing eighteen.*

"Rabbi Eliazer says he who fixes his prayer, his prayers are no supplication. Rabbi Joshua says, he who goes in a dangerous place shall pray a short prayer, saying—Help, God, thy people remaining of Israel."

From the whole passage now before them, our readers may judge how far Prideaux is justified in adducing it as evidence that the eighteen prayers were used *socially* in the synagogue in the time of Jesus—who, thereby, sanctioned the practice to us. Prideaux introduces these prayers with a "THEY SAY." "The eighteen prayers *they say*, were composed and instituted by Ezra and the great synagogue." But the fact is, if *their* authority be to be taken, that *they say* much more than this. Our Hebrew friend accompanies his translation with these remarks—"*Dr. Prideaux is very correct in his statement that the Shemonah Eshreh*" (eighteen prayers) "*were composed by Ezra and his conclave. These prayers, not alone Shemonah Eshreh, but* THE WHOLE FORM AS USED TO THE PRESENT TIME, *commenced to be framed during the Babylonish captivity, and they were established and performed during the second temple.*" The *whole* of the synagogue ritual therefore, now extended through *six octavo volumes*, THEY *say*, existed long before the time of Jesus; but their evidence proves too much, and from the whole we may infer how dangerous it is to leave scripture authority, and to depend upon the *they says* of Jewish rabbins and Mishnical doctors.

old esablished forms of the synagogue, and of the *social* prayer there, when he said, "*Every man shall pray daily "eighteen prayers?*" If he were so, how does he agree with Rabbi Joshua, who prefers the shorter formulary, and thinks *one* sufficient. Let us suppose (to illustrate the subject) a disciple of each of these learned rabbies meeting in the synagogue, and proceeding to *social* prayer—their "*liturgies or prescribed forms*" would surely but ill agree with each other. Or let us suppose two disciples of the learned "Rabbi Akila," the one of whom, being "*fluent "in the mouth,*" should use the whole eighteen prayers, and the other, not being thus endowed with the gift of speech, should use the shorter summary: we would put it to Mr. Moore himself, how far their junction would tend to illustrate his position, that "*it is impossible to invent prayers "more social in their nature*" than the forms in question. What then are the facts? That eighteen prayers *are* "*men-"tioned*" in a passage of the Mishnah; but that, in connexion with them, no mention, or even allusion is made to the *synagogue* worship; and that as *eighteen* prayers, or *one* prayer, may be used indifferently, so the *mode* of prayer here referred to, is *individual* not *social*. The facts stated by Prideaux being proved to be unfounded, his inferences necessarily fall to the ground. "*No* DOUBT," he says, "*is to be made but that they were used in our Saviour's time.*" Now looking to the character of the book from which he quotes, and to the remarks before made, we think that considerable doubt attaches to the subject. "CONSE-"QUENTLY," he adds, "*that Jesus joined in them with the "rest of the Jews, whenever he went into their synagogues, as "he always did every sabbath day.*" As the passage does *not* state that they were used in the synagogues at all, it is *not* a "*a consequence*" that Jesus joined in them there; whilst as the passage *does* state that one of two forms of prayer to the same effect might be used *at the discretion of the individual using them,* it *is* a consequence that *neither* of them could have been a *stated* and *social* form of prayer, in which Jesus could have joined every sabbath day, or on any occasion whatsoever.*

* To prove that these prayers must have been used *socially* a reference is made to their *contents*. "They were *evidently*" (Moore says) "composed for public worship, in which all who attended joined." Their *contents*, however, prove too much, for at least *four* out of these eighteen prayers were evidently written *after* the dispersion; they could not therefore have been joined in by Jesus. Prideaux feels this difficulty—"No doubt" (he says), "the eighteen prayers were used in our saviour's time;" and then he adds,—"*at least most of them!*" Mr. Moore

Yet it is upon *this* passage that Prideaux wholly, and Moore in great measure, rest the assertion that *social* prayer was the practice of the Jewish synagogue, and sanctioned by the presence of Jesus; and it is *thence* they draw their inference—that it is therefore binding upon society in the present day and throughout all ages. In the above critical analysis of this passage we have shewn that the passage does *not* support social prayer; we are bound, therefore, in the absence of other proof, to infer that Jesus did *not* sanction the practice by his presence. In *addition* to the authority deduced from *this* passage, Moore, however, (sec. 4) gives a detailed account of "*the manner in which the liturgy was recited*" in what he calls "*the ancient synagogue.*" Without going into detail on this part of the subject, it is only necessary to explain his authorities, to shew that his case is utterly

---

meets the difficulty more boldly;—he argues to prove that the whole eighteen were written by Ezra; he paves the way by quoting Vitringa's quotation from Maimonides, to shew that the three first, and the three last only of the nineteen prayers, (for the eighteen became nineteen afterwards) "were considered as stated forms; whereas the thirteen in the middle were variable, and others much shorter *were allowed to be substituted for them.*" But what became then of the *identity* of *the* eighteen prayers named in the Mishnah—one was added to make nineteen—three were then taken from each side, and thirteen in the middle were variable! But more and worse remains. "And if" (Moore observes) "the three or four prayers that have given rise to doubts, be admitted to have been composed after the final dispersion of the Jews, (though there is no necessity for that supposition) still the high antiquity of *the rest* remains unimpeached; and being mentioned in the Mishnah as old settled forms but 150 years after the birth of Christ, there can be no rational doubt that *they* (that is, rabbi Gamiliel's *eighteen* prayers, though 'three or four' of them were written afterwards) were used in all the synagogues of his time, and consequently that he joined in them every sabbath." "A *sufficient number* (he says) would remain that were indisputably ancient even in the time of Christ." A number *sufficient*, we would ask, for what purpose? Not for Mr. Moore's argument —for again we ask if the number of the prayers vary and *de*crease (as Falstaff's men of buckram *in*creased) at pleasure, how can he, or any other person, tell that the lesser number forms a part and parcel of the eighteen prayers mentioned by the learned rabbins in the Mishnah. Judging too from internal evidence, these prayers were such as Jesus could not and would not have joined in—they are *puerile, long*, and full of *vain repetitions.* Prideaux himself makes a curious use of this objection: he *allows* that they are *mean, jejune*, and *empty forms*, and that *much better might have been made*;—hence he infers against the dissenters, "First, That our Saviour disliked not set forms of prayer; and, Secondly, That he was contented to join with the public *in the meanest form* rather than seperate from it!" The late Mr. Vidler, whose copy of Prideaux now lies before us, has written this shrewd remark in the margin—"*The learned doctor begs the question here in order to have a stroke at the dissenters: he should have proved these prayers to have been extant in Christ's time, before he made these inferences.*" The learned doctor is also placed on the other horn of the dilemma; for to assert that Jesus joined in *these* prayers, is to assert that he joined in prayer which possessed all the objectionable qualities (as to vain repetition, &c.) which he censured in the prayers of others. The fact is that no one can read *these* prayers and believe that Jesus joined in or sanctioned *such* prayers, whatever may be the opinion of the party as to the general question.

void of foundation. His description of, and quotations from this liturgy, are avowedly taken from Vitringa. Vitringa's chief authority is stated by Moore himself to have been Maimonides. Who then was Maimonides? A Jewish rabbinical writer, who lived so late as the end of the *eleventh* century! His works treat at large of the services of the temple and the synagogue; he appears to have been deeply learned in the traditions of his nation, and is best known for what is considered an excellent abridgment of the Talmud; which Talmud consists of *comments*, by succeeding rabbins, upon that "collection of absurd and fabulous tra-"ditions," the Mishnah. On *this* authority, then, we find detailed in Mr. Moore's Inquiry, "*The manner in which the* "*religious worship of the ancient synagogue was conducted.*" That it was, *at some time or other*, so conducted we do not deny —it *may* have been thus for ought that appears to the contrary—but the question is, *When?* *Not*, we contend, *in the time of Jesus;* of *that* there is not the slightest proof; to prove *that*, not one authority is quoted; *that*, which is the only point in debate, *is taken for granted.* Moore copies from Vitringa—and Vitringa borrows from Maimonides—and Maimonides must have written either from his own knowledge in the eleventh, or from Jewish fables and traditions in some earlier century;* and then, upon this authority, upon the mere *they say* of some Jewish rabbins, writing in the darkest ages, that certain forms were *once, at some undefined period*, used in the Jewish synagogue, it is gratuitously assumed (contrary, as we shall presently shew, to the testimony of the scriptures) that they were so used *in the time of Christ:* and, after all these wholly unfounded and unproved assumptions, it is triumphantly concluded—"*So perfectly*

* We would not wish to detract from the merit of Maimonides, of whom it was said, "that he was the first Jew who ceased to trifle, *but that he came too late.*" The chief merit attributed to him is—that he arranged and abridged with care and ability, the monstrous mass of absurd and puerile traditions which, "like a snow ball," succeeding ages had rolled together. But however well arranged they were still absurd; however much abridged, they were still too long; and that cause is evidently a bad one, which is compelled to seek its proofs amid the stores of rabbinical tradition. Thus in defence of social prayer, we are constantly referred to Lightfoot, Buxtorf, Vitringa, and Maimonides. Hence we are carried back to the Mishnah—to the Talmud, which is formed of comments upon the Mishnah—nay, even to glosses and comments upon the Talmud; (see Moore, p. 52 and 56) that is, to comments *upon* the comments on that "collection of absurd and fabulous traditions"—the Mishnah. In this depth, however, there is no lower deep; the few words occuring in the Mishnah we have shewn do not support that which they are brought to support; the "snow ball" rolled back to the spot from which it started, has melted in the passage.

"*social was the mode of worship which Christ and his apostles*
"*sanctioned by their regular attendance upon it.*"

As evidence of the practice of the Jewish synagogue in the time of Jesus, we turn then, *thirdly*, to the New Testament; and we do this, in the *present* stage of the inquiry, not for the purpose of entering into the principles of the New Testament, or of shewing that Jesus did not sanction the practice of social prayer, but, regarding that book as an ancient and authentic historical record, our object in *now* turning to it, is simply, in the way of authority, to ascertain what, at that time, was, and what was not, the practice of the Jewish synagogue. From the Concordance we ascertain, that that institution is named in the writings of the New Testament *fifty-six* times. We ask then, how often is the *social prayer* of the synagogue, (so confidently spoken of as existing) how often is *that* named in the course of these fifty-six instances? The answer is, NOT ONCE. Jesus, and the apostles of Jesus, are frequently spoken of as visiting the synagogue—how often are they spoken of as joining in social prayer there? NOT ONCE. Let the reader's attention be directed to those passages of the New Testament which are illustrative of the service of the synagogue. Of Jesus it is said, that he *taught* in the synagogue, in the following eight passages, Mat. xiii. 54; Mark i. 21; Luke iv. 15; vi. 6; xiii. 10; John vi. 59; and xviii. 20. That he *preached* or proclaimed the gospel, or good news, there, Mark i. 39, Luke iv. 44. He is spoken of as *teaching* and *preaching*, or proclaiming, Mat. iv. 23 and ix. 35. He is described, Luke iv. 16, as going into the synagogue, as his custom was, and standing up for to *read*. For his performance of miraculous cures in the synagogues, see Mat. xii. 9; Mark iii. 1; Luke vi. 6; Mark i. 23; and Luke iv. 33; and on these occasions he is described as *speaking to* and *arguing with* those who were present;—*but in no one instance is Jesus described as joining in, or being present at the performance of social prayer*. Let us turn to the apostles. Of Paul it is said, Acts ix. 20, that he *preached* straightway in the synagogue. Acts xviii. 4, that he *reasoned* there; xvii. 1, that he reasoned out of the scriptures; xvii. 10, that the people received the word from him there and searched the scriptures; xvii. 17, that he disputed there. Of Paul and Barnabas we are told, Acts xiii. 5 and 42, that they *preached* the word in the synagogue; xiv. 1 that they *spake* there; and in xiii. 4, we find them invited to give a *word of exhortation*. Of Apollos it is recorded, Acts xviii. 26, that he *spake* boldly in the synagogue. Here,

then we have, in the synagogue, *reading*, *speaking*, *proclaiming*, *teaching*, *reasoning*, and *disputing*, on the part of Jesus and his apostles—BUT NO ONE INSTANCE OF PRAYER THERE, STILL LESS OF SOCIAL PRAYER. It may be enquired does Jesus then not speak of the prayer of the synagogue? he does, but *not* of social prayer; and that prayer of which he *does* speak, he *censures* and *forbids!* Before we notice this passage, Mat. vi. 5, 6, we will briefly state the progress of a corrupt practice, which previous to, and at the time of Jesus, had prevailed in the Jewish synagogue; and we cannot do this more completely, or more fairly, than by quoting the words of an advocate of social prayer. Prideaux (Con. part 1, b. 6) says—

"It being well understood among the Jews, that the offering up of the daily sacrifices, and the burning of incense upon the altar of incense, at the time of those sacrifices, was for the rendering of God propitious unto them, and making their prayers to be acceptable in his presence, they were very careful to make the times of these offerings, and the times of their prayers, both at the temple, and every where else, to be exactly the same. And therefore as soon as synagogues were erected among them, the hours of public devotions in them on their synagogue days, were, as to morning and evening prayers, the same hours, in which the morning and evening sacrifices were offered up at the temple. And the same hours were also observed in their private prayers, wherever performed. Most good and devout persons that were at Jerusalem, chose on those times to go up into the temple, and there offer up their prayers unto God. And thus Peter and John are said to go up into the temple at the hour of prayer, being the ninth hour of the day, which was at three in the afternoon, the time of the offering up of the evening sacrifice. For the Jews reckoned the hours of the day from six in the morning. Those who were in other places, or being at Jerusalem had not leisure to go up to the temple, did then their devotions elsewhere, all thinking themselves obliged daily to say their prayers at those times. If it were a synagogue day, they went into the synagogue, and there prayed with the congregation, and if it were not a synagogue day, they then prayed in private by themselves, and if they had leisure to go to the synagogue, they chose that for the place to do it in, thinking such an holy place the properest for such an holy exercise, though performed there in their private persons only; but if they had not leisure to go to such an holy place, *then they prayed wherever they were at the hour of prayer, though it were in the street or market place.*

This prayer it was then, the *individual*, but public prayer of the hypocrites, who, wishing to be seen of men, offered up their prayers in the synagogues, and the corners of streets, instead of offering them up in the court of the temple, the only authorised place of public prayer;—this prayer it was that Jesus censured, and it is this *kind* of prayer only, the existence of which can be inferred from this passage.* The

* Lightfoot, in his *Talmudical Exercitationes upon St.Matthew*, thus describes the corruptions which existed as to prayer: "A workman, or he that is at the top of a

defenders of the practice of social prayer (Pope, Barbauld, Moore, and others) have all been forward to shew that it was public *individual*—not public *social*—prayer which is here censured. The distinction is a just one on their part, but it also brings with it an inference which they have not been equally forward to see, namely, that it was public *individual* prayer only—and not public *social* prayer—which existed at that time. We are ourselves quite prepared to admit that Jesus did *not* censure the practice of *social* prayer, and that for a sufficient reason,—he censured *existing* abuses only, of which *social* prayer was not in his time among the number. From this passage, therefore, taken in connexion with *all* the other passages of the New Testament, in which the synagogue is spoken of, we infer, that at the time these books were written, *social* prayer was *not* practised in the synagogue. We have established then (as undertaken, p. 346) three points. First, That the synagogue worship is no pattern for us to imitate; Secondly, That the Mishnah, as referred to by Prideaux, does *not* prove the prayer of the synagogue to have been social; Thirdly, That there is strong indirect evidence from the New Testament that what is called the *service* of the synagogue did not, at that time, include prayer at all;—that the only public prayer made there was *individual* not *social;* which individual public prayer was an abuse introduced by the hypocrites of the Jewish nation; and that this, the only prayer of the Jewish synagogue, so far from being "*SANCTIONED by the regular* "*attendance of Christ and his apostles,*" was pointedly

tree, or he that rides on an ass, must instantly come down and say his prayers. The hour of the phylactorial prayers being come, their care and endeavour was to be taken in the streets, (and he ought to have added in the synagogues) whereby they might be more seen by all persons, and that the ordinary people might admire and applaud both their zeal and religion." The same writer, in his Miscellanies, page 1064, says, "For their highway prayers they have this tradition in their Talmud. —Rabbi Josi saith, On a time I was walking by the way, and I went into one of the deserts of Jerusalem to pray; then came Elias, of blessed memory, and watched me at the gate, and staid for me until I had ended my prayer; then he said unto me, 'Peace be unto thee, rabbi, wherefore wentest thou into the desert?' I said unto him, 'To pray.' He said, 'Thou mightest have prayed in the way.' Then said I, 'I was afraid lest passengers should interrupt me.' He said, 'Thou shouldst have prayed a short prayer.' At that time I learned of him three things: I learned that we should not go into the desert, that we should pray by the way, and that he that prayed by the way must pray a short prayer." "Thus far" (is the pithy remark of Lightfoot) "their Talmud maketh them letters patent for hypocrisy; fathering this bastard upon blessed Elias, who was not a highway prayer, or one that practised his own devotions in public, for he was John Baptist's type for retiredness." But all this directly confirms what we have said as to the *kind* of abuse which had taken place with regard to prayer. It was not *social* prayer which had been introduced into the highways and synagogues, but it was the public *individual* prayer of "Rabbi Josi" and his brethren.

CENSURED by Jesus, and that *his* disciples were commanded —NOT TO IMITATE IT.

Let us now briefly recapitulate the points we have established. Looking at the whole argument, and at the general question as stated in our first volume, (p. 215) our limits have enabled us to go, in detail through *four*, only, of the *eleven* points there proposed for discussion. We have shewn—First, (see vol. i. p. 21) That there is no evidence to prove that social prayer was commanded by Deity at the creation of man, or at any time throughout the patriarchal ages; Secondly, We have proved that it was *not* then practised *without* such a command; Thirdly, (vol. i. p. 321, vol. ii. p. 45, 162, 254) that it was *not* instituted by Moses, or afterwards, by divine direction, introduced into the tabernacle or into the temple worship; and, Fourthly, in our present Essay, we have, as we think, established that it was not, even without such divine direction, practised by the Jewish people, in their synagogue or elsewhere. We are justified then in drawing this general inference—THAT UP TO THE TIME OF THE COMING OF THE MESSIAH, PUBLIC SOCIAL PRAYER WAS NEVER COMMANDED BY DEITY, AND THAT, PREVIOUSLY TO THAT PERIOD, IT WAS NEVER PARCTISED BY THE PEOPLE WHOM HE HAD CHOSEN. It would have remained for us, had our work been continued, to have entered into the *after*, and, to us, more important questions—was this practice commanded by Jesus, instituted by his apostles, or made a part of the religious worship of the assembly of believers, which has been called the Christian church? Our past inquiries have much narrowed this question. The defenders of social prayer have all of them been disposed, in the absence of more positive proof, to *let in* the practice by asserting, that it was previously established under former dispensations; that Jesus, having found the practice universally existing, sanctioned it by his presence, and, by implication, approved of and adopted it. The whole of these arguments are fallacious or inconclusive, even if the facts from which they are drawn, were not unfounded. *Many* religious practices existed during the patriarchal ages, and under the Mosaic dispensation—practices sanctioned too by the presence of Jesus and his disciples, which are, and ought to be, *now* discontinued. The whole system of ritual observances was expressly abolished by Jesus. The Jewish temple speedily after his time ceased to exist, and with it, for example, the appointed *sacrifice* of the Jewish temple.

Had social prayer been commanded and practised there, *that*, as being a public ritual, and a part of the ceremonial service, would have also ceased. But the question does not hinge here. Social prayer *not* having (as we have shewn) previously existed, either by divine command, or otherwise, among the Jewish people, it can only have become part of Christianity, not by implication, BUT BY THE EXPRESS COMMAND OF JESUS OR HIS APOSTLES. The reader may examine for himself, as we have done, the whole of the New Testament, and will find THAT NO SUCH COMMAND WAS EVER GIVEN. Here the question may be said to have ended. An outward observance (for *social* prayer evidently *is* an outward observance, or it could not *be* social) to be imperative must be appointed and commanded: the converse of the position equally holds good, if *not* appointed or commanded—then it is *not* imperative. There are, however, for fuller conviction, certain tests by which this question may more closely be tried. We cannot now, as we had once proposed, enter fully into these, but must content ourselves with throwing out HINTS, which inquiring minds may pursue in detail, and from which they may form conclusions for themselves.

First, *The principles of Christianity, and the nature of the system established by Jesus, through his apostles.* Forming a part of the Abrahamic covenant, and agreeing in its objects and its principles with the Mosaic dispensation, it differed with the latter, chiefly, in extending the privilege of fellowship with the family of God to all nations, instead of confining it to the Jewish people; and, as a consequence, in abolishing the outward and ceremonial religious worship, which, from a belief in the peculiar presence of Jehovah, was established in the Jewish temple. The religion taught by Jesus then, was peculiarly and emphatically a mental religion; it contained neither rite nor ceremony—it had no temple—no sacrifice—no priest—no peculiar or appointed *place* of prayer. The cause or occasion of publicity in prayer had ceased, and prayer, even if Jesus had left *no* command on the subject, would, by natural inference, and as a matter of course, have become private. The answer of Jesus to the woman of Samaria is well known, and is full to our present purpose. The Samaritans and the Jews agreed in principle—that Jehovah was to be publicly worshipped, as being peculiarly present, in ONE place only; the very fact of their difference shews, that neither party would allow he could be so worshipped in *two* places. The question put to

Jesus, then, means, *which* of these temples is that *one* peculiar and *exclusive* place of *public* worship; and his answer, which divides itself into two parts, amounts to this—the JEWISH temple in the past, "*for salvation is of the Jews, and they* "*know what they worship;*" but, for the future, NEITHER of these temples, because the peculiar presence was to cease—the *public* worship was to be discontinued—rites and ceremonies were to be abolished—and the true worshippers of the father, were henceforth to worship him only in their lives, their principles, and their conduct, as members of his family—"*in spirit and in truth.*" Turning from the general term worship, to the peculiar mode of worship—*prayer*, the matter stands thus:—*social* prayer was *never* practised by the Jewish people. They were permitted publicly to pray, *individually*, in the courts of the temple, *because* Jehovah was in the temple peculiarly present. The effect ceased, or ought to have ceased, with the cause. Individual prayer, no longer *public*, because Jehovah was no longer believed to be peculiarly present in one place, became necessarily private, because he was believed to be equally present in every place. God was to be addressed in prayer by the children of his family—in the closet—with the door closed—in secret—in the hope that he who heard in secret would reward the sincere prayer of the righteous man openly. Thus much for the *principles* laid down and inculcated by Jesus. We notice, Secondly, *The practice and example of Jesus and his apostles.* What is the recorded conduct of Jesus? On three occasions it is said of him that he went *into a mountain*, in one of these cases it is emphatically said *apart* to pray (Mark vi. 46, Luke vi. 12, Mat. xiv. 23); he departs (Mark i. 35) *into a solitary place* and prays; he (Luke v. 16) *withdraws into the wilderness* and prays; he addresses even his bosom friends, his chosen disciples (Mat. xxvi. 36, &c.) "*Sit ye here, whilst I go and* "*pray* YONDER."* His disciples are spoken of (Luke ix.

* Dr. Disney, in his "Defence of Public or Social Worship, a Sermon preached in the Unitarian Chapel, Essex Street, 1791," endeavours to *explain away* the recorded example of Jesus, the force of which he evidently feels. "That Christ (he says) frequently retired to pray alone, instead of joining in social worship, is very true; but we are not thence to conclude that he was averse to public prayer. On these occasions he *may* have been determined by the circumstances of the case, which *might* have reference to his peculiar mission; or he *may* have been influenced by the state of his own mind, the fatigue of body, the desire to leave his disciples for a while without *the restraint of his presence* (!) or the peculiar trials to which he was exposed. All or any of these considerations *may* have disposed him to retire alone without intending in the least degree to discountenance social prayer." The real question is—what was the example of Jesus? We find him *often* spoken

as "*with him*," that is, accompanying him, but still, whilst praying, he is ALONE, and they come to him, probably when he has concluded, requesting him to "*TEACH them to pray;*" a request they *would* not have made, if they had always heard his social prayers, and *need* not have made, if he, like the priests of the present day, had taken the labour off their hands, and "led their devotions." Though prayer, as a general rule and a regular practice, should be private, there are peculiar cases and extraordinary circumstances, which will justify its being made in public; but then it must be individual. The words of Jesus at the grave of Lazarus, (John xi. 41) although an instance of thanksgiving, *not* of prayer, may be taken as indirectly bearing on this subject—"*Father I thank thee that thou hast* "*heard me.*" The peculiar reason for this departure from his usual rule, is added by Jesus himself—"*And* I *knew* "*that thou hearest me always; but* BECAUSE OF THE "PEOPLE, *which stand by, I said it, that they may believe* "*that thou hast sent me.*" This explanation will apply to several other passages, in which the prayer of the apostles is spoken of, when, whilst exercising miraculous powers conferred on them by Deity, they appealed publicly to that Being, in whose name, and by whose authority, they claimed to act. But this was, even at the time, not social, for the people could not join in such addresses; and it is no example to us, for *we* possess no miraculous powers, in support of which

---

of as praying individually, and *never* spoken of as praying socially; putting aside mere surmises, as to what *may* have been—what *is* the direct inference? It will not be said that the life of Jesus afforded no *opportunities* for social prayer. Some of the situations above quoted would, by a modern priest, be deemed the best fitted for it. The comment of Gilbert Wakefield, on the passages Matt. xiv. 23, and Mark vi. 47, will not readily admit of a reply. "Jesus had been feeding by a miracle five thousand persons. While their hearts were expanding with gratitude to their benefactor, and their souls wrapt in admiration of this stupendous exertion on their behalf, what a glorious opportunity, one would have thought, was then offered for social worship with the multitude. At least, all methodists, and most dissenters, would have set about the pious operation with fervour, and have continued their prayers till midnight. How different from such fanaticism was the conduct of the Son of God. He, as on all other occasions, left the people to the secret impressions and undisturbed impulse of their own minds, and himself, in the mean time, far from the bustle and inspection of the *congregation*, retired to offer up his unostentatious devotions to that omnipotent Spirit who saw in secret, and would reward him openly." Upon the conduct of Jesus in the garden of Gethsemane, Wakefield observes—"According to the prevalent notions of prayer and devotion in after times, no occasion could call more loudly for sympathizing and social ejaculations, than this before us." There is, indeed, much to be inferred from the *silence* of the New Testament writers; the occasions are many in which, if it had been his practice at all, Jesus would have prayed socially, and in which the historian would have recorded his prayer. See in illustration of this, accounts of public meetings, ordinations, &c. amongst the methodists and others.

we can appeal to heaven. The prayer or address of Jesus to his heavenly father recorded in John xvii. is also a departure from his usual practice, inasmuch as, being intended for the especial purpose of encouraging his disciples, it is offered up in their presence, but then it is strictly and wholly individual not social, it was *his* not *their* prayer.* The whole argument of Moore and others, as to the synagogue worship, is founded upon the *implied admission* that there is no *direct* evidence in the New Testament that Jesus joined in social prayer. It is *because* it is nowhere recorded that Jesus joined in social prayer, that these writers are driven to *assert*, that social prayer was practised in the synagogue, and to *infer* that Jesus sanctioned it by his presence. We have proved the *assertion* to be unfounded, and the *inference* follows of course;—but we contend further that the mode of proof adopted by Moore and others, is an *admission* that there is no evidence on record, in the scriptures, that Jesus attended or sanctioned social prayer. The same assertion may be safely made as to all the apostles. We find them, in no case, instituting public social prayer, and nowhere themselves practising it.†

* This prayer is as absolutely *individual* as a prayer could possibly be: not only did no one join in it with Jesus, but no one *could* have joined him in it, as the language is fit for the Messiah alone. Yet, in one of the replies to Gilbert Wakefield, (by Eusebia) we find the following *bold* assertion: "In the seventeenth chapter of St. John, our Lord has himself given us an example of SOCIAL prayer!" This reply is, however, a very superficial performance. The reply by Mr. Parry, by far the ablest that was written, says, "Here (John seventeenth) is a *direct* and *positive* proof of an act of *social* worship, in which Christ engaged *with* his apostles. Here is a prayer, and not a very short one, presented to his heavenly father, *in their company*." The reader will not fail to observe the attempt at confounding two very different things—the praying *with* them—*and in their company*. Pope says, (p. 59) "The prayer of Christ was *so far social*, that it was uttered in the presence of his disciples." We can only say in reply—that it was *so far social*, as to be strictly *individual*. Moore also (103) speaks of this, inferentially, as a case of *social* prayer. We give these as samples of the unfair commentaries on scripture by which social prayer has been supported.

† R. Wright (Essay on Religious Worship) boasts that "neither Christ nor his disciples *prohibited* social prayer." This is not enough. We call upon them to produce the case in which they *commanded* or signified their approval of it. The advocates of the practice find the silence of Jesus and his apostles an extremely *awkward* circumstance to account for. Moore suggests (103) that Jesus was otherwise employed, and that to "have introduced the practice of social prayer by a new method, was impracticable, and the attempt would have been highly improper." Mrs. Barbauld very dexterously puts us on the horns of a dilemma (p. 29); "This, at least, is evident, if, in the time of our Saviour, they had no worship similar to ours, he could not mean by any thing he said, to hint a dislike to it; and if they had, he must have sanctioned the practice by conforming to it." To this instance of feminine logic, we reply—*this*, at least, is evident:—that, if, as we have proved, in the time of Jesus, there did not exist the practice of social prayer, then he could not have sanctioned it by his presence; and if he neither sanctioned it as an established practice, nor commanded it as a new one, how can it be binding

There are passages, indeed, from which, by a forced construction, and by leaving out of consideration the peculiar circumstances of the times, an inference has been falsely drawn in favour of social prayer. We shall notice, but can only *briefly* reply to some of them. Jesus, addressing himself specifically to his apostles, promises them, in the performance of their difficult task, counsel from above, and the aid of miraculous powers. Whatsoever they bound or loosed on earth, he promises should be bound or loosed in heaven; adding, Mat. xviii. 18, "*again I say unto you that if two or* "*three of you*" (my disciples) "*shall agree on earth as* "*touching any thing, that they shall ask, it shall be done for* "*them of my father which is in heaven.*" That he is here speaking of miraculous powers to be given at the request of his disciples, is further evident from what follows—"*For* "*where two or three are gathered together in my name, there* "*am I in the midst of them.*"* In the same spirit, he afterwards, (Mat. xxviii. 18) when sending them forth to "*teach all nations,*" speaks of all power as having been given him in heaven and earth, and promises to be "*with them* "*unto the end of the age.*" See particularly on this subject, Mat. xvii. 21; John xiv. 12, xvi. 23, xx. 21. The cases in which the disciples exercised this privilege, peculiar to their circumstances and objects, must be carefully distinguished from social prayer; and yet *all* these cases have been repeatedly and confidently cited in favour of the practice in our time. Thus, (Acts viii. 15) Peter and John *pray* (but no doubt individually) that certain

on his followers? Mrs. Barbauld, in another place, (p. 25) makes rather a sweeping concession: "With regard to the character of our Saviour himself, it is certain he did not always call upon his disciples to share that more intimate and, if I may so say, confidential intercourse with his heavenly Father, which he may be supposed to have been favoured with; *and, it must be confessed, there is no formal mention made of any exercise of this kind, either with them, or with the people at large; but his whole life was a prayer.*"

* For the real sense of this passage, and to prove that it does not refer to social prayer, we are content to refer to the comments of even the defenders of the practice. *Priestly* says of it, (Familiar Illustration of Passages of Scripture, p. 42) "If we consider the whole of this passage, in which our Lord is speaking of the great power of which his apostles could be possessed, and especially of the efficacy of their prayers, we shall be satisfied that he could only mean by this form of expression—*to represent their power with God, when they were assembled as his disciples,* and prayed so as became his disciples, to be the same as his own power with God." Mr. *Fox*, in his sermon, entitled "The Comparative Tendency of Unitarianism and Calvinism," thus remarks on the passages, Acts vii. 59; 2 Cor. xii. 8—9. "With Stephen and Paul, Jesus was personally present; he was the depository of that miraculous power which was communicated to them as the interests of his cause required; *their application to him was no more divine worship than are our petitions for protection to a powerful friend or magistrate.*" Yet these passages, and other similar ones, are constantly quoted by Moore and others, as cases of social prayer, which they call upon us, in the present day, to imitate!

Samaritans may receive the Holy Spirit. It is after they have fasted and prayed, (individually, no doubt, for we have no information to the contrary) that the prophets and teachers lay their hands on Paul and Barnabas, and send them away to the work for which they were chosen. It is after prayer for divine direction, that the successor of Judas is chosen, (Acts i. 24); that the deacons are approved by the apostles, (Acts vi. 6); that Paul and Barnabas commend to the Lord the elders ordained in every church. (Acts xiv. 23.) Of the apostles and first Christians too, after the resurrection of Jesus, and whilst waiting for the promised gifts of the spirit, it is stated that they continued with one accord in prayer and supplication; that they continued stedfastly in doctrine and in fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and of *prayer*. The apostles go up to the temple at the hour of prayer; they speak of giving themselves to *prayer*, as well as to the ministry. Yet in all these cases, it having been already established that social prayer was neither practised nor commanded, it follows that the prayer here spoken of was *individual* prayer. In all the writings of the apostles there is not one command for social prayer. In the churches established by the apostles no such practice was instituted. The prominent or active members of the body, are described by Paul, 1 Cor. xii. 28; they are—apostles, prophets, teachers, those who worked miracles, had gifts of healing, helps, governments, diversities of tongues; but none are spoken of as leading the *prayers* of the congregation. Timothy is exhorted (1 Tim. iv. 13) to be an example to believers, giving attendance (*not* to social prayer, but) to reading, to exhortation, to doctrine. Titus, when sent to regulate the churches, is exhorted (ii. 1) to speak sound doctrine; (4) to teach; (6) to exhort; (15) to rebuke with authority;—but he is nowhere called upon to be *strong* (to use a modern, we may say a technical phrase on the subject) in social prayer. Believers are exhorted, by the writer to the Hebrews, (x. 23) to hold fast their faith, to provoke each other to love and good works, not to forsake the assembling themselves together, but to meet, and that for the purpose, *not* of social prayer, but of exhorting one another. There are, indeed, passages in the New Testament, which, in the absence of a proper explanation, have been perverted to prove that the early churches *did* practise social prayer; as we have seen that there are other passages which, by a similar perversion, were brought to prove that social prayer was the practice of the Jewish temple, &c. but our limits will not now enable us, as

we had originally intended, critically to examine these and shew, as we could have shewn, their inapplicability or insufficiency. But in the passages above referred to, we have strong, although incidental evidence, that social prayer was *not* a part of Christianity, or a duty of what has been called the Christian church.

THE *origin* of the practice of social prayer, and its introduction into the churches after the apostolic age, we had also intended to have treated on. The choral hymns of the pagans addressed to their Gods, (whence was derived the chorus of their theatrical representations) together with the public, but *individual* prayer of the Jewish synagogue, would pre-dispose the heathen as well as the Jewish converts, to join in introducing a public ceremonial in prayer; the singing of psalms and hymns being added, to amuse and "take off the weariness of the people."* The hireling

* The order of the church services, in the second, third, and fourth centuries, will be found fully stated in Cave's Primitive Christianity, part i. chap. 9. That writer having from the writings of the fathers, &c. "picked up and put together, what seems to have constituted the main body of their public duties." "At their first coming together (he says) into the congregation they began with prayer, as Tertullian at least probably intimates, (for I do not find it in any before him); we come together (says he) unto God, that being banded as it were into an army, we may besiege him with our prayers and petitions; a violence which is very pleasing and grateful to him. I do not from hence positively conclude, that prayer was the first duty they began with, though it seems fairly to look that way; especially if Tertullian meant to represent the order as well as the substance of their devotions. After this followed the reading of the scriptures, both of the Old and New Testament, both the Commentaries of the Apostles, and the Writings of the Prophets, as Justin Martyr informs us." "Not only the canonical scriptures, but many of the writings of apostolical men, (such as were eminent for place and piety) were in those days publicly read in the church; such was the famous Epistle of St. Clemens to the Corinthians, of which, and the custom in like cases, Dionysius bishop of Corinth, who lived about the year 172, gives Soter bishop of Rome this account: To day (says he) we kept holy the Lord's day, wherein we read your epistle, which we shall constantly read for our instruction, as we also do the first epistle which Clemens wrote to us. The like Eusebius reports of Hermas his Pastor, (a book so called) and S. Hierom of the writings of S. Ephrem, the famous deacon of Edessa, that in some churches they were publicly read after the reading of the holy scriptures. About this part of the service it was that they sung hymns and psalms." "These hymns were either extemporary raptures, so long as immediate inspiration lasted; or set compositions, either taken out of the holy scriptures, or of their own composing, as Tertullian tells us." The council of Laodicea (A. D. 365) "appointed that these psalms should not be one entire continued service, but that a lesson should be interposed in the midst, after every psalm; which was done (as Balsamon and Alexius Aristenus tells us) *to take off the weariness of the people*, whose minds might be apt to tire in passing through those prolix offices all together, especially the lessons being so large and many. In this duty the whole congregation bore a part, joining all together in a common celebration of the praises of God; afterwards the custom was to sing alternatim, course by course, answering one another; first brought in (as we are told) by Flavianus and Diodorus in the church of Antioch, in the reign of Constantine: but if we may believe Socrates, some hundred of years before that by Ignatius, who was bishop of that church; who

teacher at length insinuated himself into, and became established in the Christian church; by an absurd, but interested application of a *name*, after the *thing* had ceased, he was called, in imitation of the courtiers of the Jewish temple, the *priest*, or courtier of heaven. (See p. 53.) As a courtier implied a palace, splendid churches, or temples as they were and still are called, were erected, in direct opposition to the teaching of Jesus, that the temple at Jerusalem should be destroyed, and no other *peculiar* place of worship be established; as the priest no longer offered up *sacrifices* for the people, an expedient appears to have been hit upon, and he offered up their *prayers*, in direct violation of the command of Jesus, that the prayer of *his* disciples should be offered up in the closet. The priest presented himself as an *intercessor*, who stood between God and man, to conciliate the former and protect the latter. He was the favoured courtier, who presented the petition to the monarch, into whose presence the humble subjects themselves, without *his*, the priests' protection, would not dare to enter. The priest then, on this ground, claims to present the prayers of the people: he prays *for* them, he is their mouth-piece; and then, by another solecism in terms, this prayer of *one individual* is called *joint* or *social* prayer!

---

having in a vision *heard the angels praising the holy trinity*, with alternate hymns, thereupon introduced the use of it in that church, which from thence spread itself into all other churches." He then states that an exposition of a certain portion of scripture took place, which has been since called a sermon. That the system of Jesus had in those ages become *wholly corrupt*, and unfit to be held forth to us as a precedent or example, is evident from what follows. "Well, sermon being ended, prayers were made with and for the catechumens, penitents, possessed, and the like, according to their respective capacities and qualifications; the persons that were in every rank departing as soon as the prayer that particularly concerned them was done; first the catechumens, and then the penitents, as is prescribed in the nineteenth canon of the Laodicean council: for no sooner was the service thus far performed, but all that were under baptism, or under the discipline of penance, *i. e.* all that might not communicate at the Lord's table, were commanded to depart, the deacon crying aloud, *those that are catechumens go out.*" "The catechumens, &c. being departed, and the church doors shut, they proceeded to the Lord's supper, at which the faithful only might be present, wherein they prayed for all states and ranks of men, gave the kiss of charity, prayed for consecration of the eucharist, then received the sacramental elements, made their offerings, and such like." The church in this age, being in fact a *pagan*—not a *Christian*, church, had its *mysteries* and *recondite doctrines*, which, Cave observes, they were "very shy" of imparting to those without, the "weak understanding of a catechumen being no more able to bear such sublime *mysteries* than a sick man's head can large and immoderate draughts of wine." We trust that the defenders of social prayer will have too much discernment to quote in favour of the practice the customs of ages so corrupt in Christian doctrine and discipline, as those described in the above extracts. The *social prayers* and the *mysteries* of those ages must stand or fall together.

THE question between extemporaneous prayer, where one man prays, and the rest are silent; and liturgies and set forms, where the people either wholly or occasionally join, has been made a large question, and much has been said and written on both sides. Each party has produced unanswerable arguments, to prove that the other side was in the wrong; and then, upon the fallacious principle that the converse of the wrong must be right, each has inferred that they were themselves correct. Against extemporaneous prayer, *not* previously concerted between the priest and the people, it has been strongly argued that the whole is left in the breast of one, perhaps insufficient and injudicious individual to put up what form of prayer he pleases on the part of the people: who are called on to petition for what, perhaps, they do not want, and to join in sentiments which they neither feel nor approve of. Is it either decent, it has been asked, or right, or consistent with due reverence in prayer, that the substance of it should not have been carefully weighed, its language correctly studied, and the purport of it previously submitted to those who incur the responsibility of joining in its petition? Hence a strong inference has been drawn against extemporaneous prayer; and hence, conversely, a supposed inference has been drawn in favour of set forms and pre-composed liturgies. But against *these*, also, the objections of their opponents are unanswerable. Set forms, it has been well argued,* hinder

* Dr. Watts, in his "Guide to Prayer," states, amongst others, the following reasons against *set forms* of prayer. They are good in themselves, but we quote them with the more pleasure, as at least the greater part of them hold equally good against what is called public *extemporaneous* prayer, of which the doctor was the advocate. Prayer by set forms, "much hinders (he says) the free exercise of *our own* thoughts and desires," (query—if the *extemporaneous* prayer of a priest in a chapel does not equally do this?) "which is the chief work and business of prayer—namely, to express our desires to God; and whereas our thoughts and affections should direct our words—a set form of words directs our thoughts and affections." (And this, on *any* plan, must be the case where *another* prays *for* us.) "It leads us into the danger of hypocrisy and mere lip service. Sometimes we shall be tempted to use words that are not suited to our present wants, or sorrows, or requests, because these words are put together and made ready beforehand." (If there are set forms, men can at least beforehand deliberate upon, and reject them; but they have no such negative power when the priest prays extemporaneously.) "It is very apt to make our spirits cold and flat, formal and indifferent in our devotion; the frequent repetition of the same words doth not always awaken the same affections in our hearts which, perhaps, they were well suited to do when we first heard or made use of them." "A constant use of forms will much hinder our knowledge of ourselves, and prevent our acquaintance with our own hearts, which is one great spring of maintaining inward religion in the power of it. Daily observation of our own spirits would teach us what our wants are, and how to frame our prayers before God; but if we tie ourselves down to the same words always, our observation of our hearts will be of little use, since we must speak the same expressions, let our hearts

the free exercise of our own thoughts and desires—they lead us into hypocrisy and lip service—they make our spirits cold, and our devotions formal; the same words cease to excite the same ideas—they become insipid—they pall upon the ear—and the sense of devotion is wholly lost. Against *public* prayer then, *whether extemporaneous or pre-composed*, there are unanswerable objections. What then is the alternative? The Christian is prepared with a reply—that kind of prayer commanded by Jesus—"*but ye, when ye pray, "enter into your closet, and shut your door, and pray to your "father in secret; and your heavenly father, which seeth in "secret, shall reward you openly.*"

Upon this ground—that *social* prayer was *never* commanded, and that *public* prayer was directly and strongly censured by Jesus—we take our stand; but as arguments are still adduced, and frequently repeated, abstractly, in favour of the practice, we shall, previously to leaving the subject, adduce some of these, adding *hints* merely in the way of reply to them.

It is argued that men have all one common nature, with similar feelings, thoughts, and wants, and that we stand in the same relation to Deity. We reply—that, though men *have* one common nature, their feelings, their thoughts, and their desires are very different; and that, therefore, it is absurd that their prayers should be the same: and we further reply, that all men do *not* stand in the same relation to Deity, the members of the church alone being called his children, and authorized to pray to him. (See vol. i. p. 4.) It is admitted by the defenders of the practice, that petitions fitted for social prayer, should be addressed to the feelings

---

be how they will." (In the person of the priest extemporaneous prayer may remove this evil, but for the congregation, they are equally "*tied down*" in either case.) "It renders our converse with God very imperfect, for it is not possible that forms of prayer should be composed that are perfectly suited to all our powers and occasions; our circumstances are always altering; we have new sins to be confessed, new temptations and sorrows to be represented, new wants to be supplied. Every change of providence in the affairs of a nation, a family, or a person, requires suitable petitions or acknowledgments; and all these can never be well provided for in a *prescribed composition*." All this we hold to be unanswerable in the way of argument against set forms, but still it recurs to us to ask, if a prescribed form for the above reason will not suit the same man for fifty successive Sundays, how can an extemporaneous form suit fifty men on the same Sunday, seeing that "every change of providence" to each of these individuals would "require a suitable petition and acknowledgment?" We wish that the advocates of set forms and extemporaneous public prayer, would but fairly and honestly discuss the differences between them. We are persuaded that each could prove to the other that *their* mode was absurd and unscriptural, and nothing could then remain but the individual prayer of the closet. The truth is with neither of these parties.

of all, and such as all may join in—yet that "they should con-
"tain no sentiment but what any truly virtuous and pious per-
"son can approve." (Wright.) In reply we say—that such a form of prayer it is *impossible* to compose. A prayer adapted to the humble, the pure, and the virtuous, is evidently unfit to be also put into the mouth of the proud, the thoughtless, and the wicked. No one form of prayer can exactly express the feelings of two men, or even of the same man at different periods. We had extracted *specimens* of prayer from the printed forms of establishments, and collected others from the extemporaneous effusions of dissenting preachers, (Unitarian, Methodist, and others) which would have put this, had room allowed it, in a striking point of view. Looking closely at the language used, and fairly at the characters of the individuals assembled, there are numerous *falsehoods* stated in almost every case of social prayer which we have ever heard offered up. The parties do *not* feel, or they are not *justified* in feeling, the sentiments which the priest, IN THE PRESENCE OF GOD, declares that they *do* feel, and presumes to offer up in their name.

It is argued that sociality is natural to man; that we neither laugh nor weep in private; that piety is increased in society; that devotion will burst forth—"joy being too "brilliant a thing to be confined within our own bosoms— "that the mind, therefore, calls in all above, around, below, "to help the burthen of its gratitude." (Barbauld, p. 19.) That without social prayer religion would become extinct, and there would be "no outward badge or visible token of "religion." We answer that all these positions are erroneous, because they confound social religion with social prayer. In the primitive churches, there was union, friendship, intercourse, mutual admonition, *because* there was no priest; as all might then *speak* and *teach* in the church, the feelings of devotion were encouraged by sociality; but *prayer*, that peculiar expression of devout feeling which is addressed to God alone, was individual and private. We ask too, looking at our churches and chapels, how joy can "*burst forth*" and be "*too brilliant to be confined*," when no words whatever *burst forth*, except from the priest; or where all are confined to the same set form of words, in which same set form, constantly reiterated, they are equally compelled to express the *brilliancy* of their joy, or the *gloom* of their sorrow.* The *sociality* of modern prayer,

* Few things can be more absurd than some of the rhapsodies which have been written in favour of what is called *social* prayer; let us only remember what it is,

where only *one* man prays, is after all a strange kind of sociality;* and the position that religion would be extinct without it, is best answered by the fact, that the author and end of religion has never commanded, and that his messengers have never instituted it.

The extraordinary *effects* of social prayer have been described in glowing colours, and adduced as forming a strong argument in favour of the practice. Piety, we are told, by

and how performed; that either all join in a set form, or all subscribe to the words of another, the priest, and that in *neither* case have the people the power to *alter one word* of what is offered up in their names, and then see the utter absurdity of the following remarks of Mrs. Barbauld: "One class of religious duties separately considered, tends to depress the mind, filling it with ingenuous shame and wholesome sorrow; and to these humiliating feelings solitude might perhaps be found congenial: but the sentiments of admiration, love, and joy, swell the bosom with emotions which seek for fellowship and communication. The flame indeed may be kindled by silent musing; but when kindled it must infallibly spread. The devout heart, penetrated with large and affecting views of the immensity of the works of God, the harmony of his laws, and the extent of his beneficence, bursts into *loud and vocal* expressions of praise and adoration; and, from a full and overflowing sensibility, seeks to expand itself to the utmost limits of creation. The mind is forcibly carried out of itself, and, embracing the whole circle of animated existence, calls on all above, around, below, to help to bear the burden of its gratitude. Joy is too brilliant a thing to be confined within our own bosoms; it burnishes all nature, and with its vivid colouring gives a kind of factitious life to objects without sense or motion." Having given a high-wrought description of an appeal to caves, and hills, and groves, this writer adds—"And can he who, not satisfied with the wide range of existence, calls for the sympathy of the inanimate creation, refuse to worship with his fellow men? Can he who bids 'Nature attend,' forget to 'join every *living* soul' in the universal hymn? Shall we *suppose* companions in the stillness of deserts, and shall we overlook them amongst friends and townsmen? It cannot be! Social worship, for the devout heart, is not more a duty than it is a real want." We suspect that if some half dozen only of the attendants on the chapel at the "Gravel Pits, Hackney," were to "burst forth into the *loud and vocal* expressions of praise and devotion" described above, they would be quickly called upon not to disturb the *social* prayer of the reverend gentleman in the pulpit. There is *one mode only* in which the feelings of piety could be *socially* expressed, and that is not by public prayer led by the priest—*but by teaching and mutual exhortation, as practised in the primitive churches;* but to attain to this, THE PRIEST MUST BE REMOVED.

* A familiar illustration of this absurdity has been adduced in a "Reply to Mr. Wright's Thoughts on Social Prayer," by a member of our body. "Mr. Wright and other Unitarian priests contend for *social* prayer, and yet, strange to say, in their chapels they (the priests) arrogate to themselves individually the right of praying for the whole meeting, the rest maintaining perfect silence—certainly a most *unsocial* practice! Let us illustrate this matter by a familiar example. Imagine a man extremely attached to the habit of smoking, and following it morning, noon, and night; suppose this man a priest or a missionary, and that his congregation were as much attached to smoking as himself. Suppose him farther defending the practice, and proving that, in conformity with the nature of man, it ought to be performed *socially;* and then having the impudence to propose, that this *social* practice, should consist in his sitting in the pulpit and smoking *in the name and on the part of the whole;* and suppose, to crown the whole, that he should manage *to be paid* for thus depriving his congregation of doing that which they thought a pleasure or advantage. We have here a faint picture of the absurdity of the hireling priest performing *social* prayer."

this means becomes "exalted, diffused, and extended." (Jervis). By "a happy contagion" doubts vanish in a moment, and give way to sincere and cordial feeling" (Barbauld, p. 42). "Feuds and animosities are composed" —general and enlarged benevolence established (Pope, p. 20). The rich and the poor meet on equal terms; benevolence pursues the latter to their cottages, till poverty exists only as "a sober shade in the picture of life: the humble ranks find themselves in company with the higher orders, and learn that they are of the same species;" the poor man "rises from his knees and feels himself a man." Writers have, indeed, bordered on sedition in describing the effects of this practice. "*Every time social worship is celebrated it includes "a virtual declaration of* THE RIGHTS OF MAN." (Barbauld, p. 46.) In reply to all this high wrought description, we can only appeal to *facts*. Social prayer has now, for many centuries past, been fully and fairly tried—*has* it produced the effects here attributed to it? It is now, and for some centuries has been, established by law, and in practice throughout every civilized country in the world;—*have* the diffusion and extension of piety been consequent on this practice? *Are* feuds composed? *Is* general benevolence established? On the contrary—have not wars without number, and persecution of every kind existed; and that, not only concurrently with the practice of social prayer—but supported—and mainly supported too—by the very priests who administer it? *Has* social prayer created a feeling of equality between the rich and the poor? *Has* it proclaimed THE RIGHTS OF MAN? On the contrary—has it not been *most* practised and most zealously defended in those very countries where there were the grossest inequalities of rank, and where, by the united aid of priests and princes, the "rights of man" have *never* been proclaimed? We are speaking of the *effects* of social prayer—not of what theoretically *may* be —but of what practically *have* been the effects—either of social prayer, or of THAT PERNICIOUS AND ANTI-CHRISTIAN SYSTEM OF PRIESTCRAFT OF WHICH IT FORMS A PROMINENT AND ESSENTIAL PART. Neither let it be said that it is the *abuse* of social prayer which is thus pernicious. Public social prayer is in itself and essentially an abuse;—it is the *abuse of prayer* —private and individual being the *use* or proper mode of praying.

Public social prayer is a ceremony: it teaches men to rest on the forms of religion instead of the substance: It compels them to depend on the intercession of the priest,

in lieu of depending on their own character and virtue. It creates too a necessity for a hireling body, whose *interest* it is to keep mankind in ignorance. It is a specious and an easy mode of satisfying the conscience and imposing on the world. As practised in our churches and chapels, it totally excludes *all* the principles of Christian fellowship. It raises one man high above his fellows, who alone has the privilege of thinking or of speaking, or of addressing himself to his Maker; it seals the lips of the rest, or only allows them to repeat a set form of words. It totally supersedes and excludes the duties of mutual exhortation and admonition. It has a direct and inevitable tendency to create spiritual pride and hypocrisy; it is *essentially*, by its very nature, ostentatious and inconsistent with a really devout spirit; if the mind were only *as well* fitted for prayer in private as in public, still, for various reasons, prayer to God ought to be private; but the mind is evidently *better* fitted for prayer in private than in public. *Public* prayer to an all-seeing God who knows the thoughts of our hearts is evidently unnecessary; *social* prayer, when our wants are different, our feelings different, and our states of mind different, is an evident absurdity. Social prayer must, in a great majority of cases, be presumptuous, and even blasphemous; for it compels all men, and all alike, to adopt the language of piety; it puts into the lips of all the same confession, the same expression of penitence, the same faith, the same ardour, the same love of God, the same dependence on his mercies. It pre-supposes that all have the same petitions to offer,—when the desires of men differ; and it assumes that all have agreed to a form—which either they have never heard before, or which, if they have heard and disapprove, they are not allowed to alter or amend. The pernicious effects of social prayer *might* be painted in yet stronger colours, for they are mixed up with all the evils and all the abuses which have been entailed by priestcraft upon Christianity. But to the believer in revelation we say every thing, when we say—that social prayer has never received the sanction of heaven; that it was never commanded or practised by the patriarchs, by Moses, or by Jesus; that it is inconsistent with the mental and retiring principles of Christianity, and (inasmuch as to be social it must be public) opposed by the express command of Jesus. In condemning the practice of *public social* prayer, let it not be supposed that we oppose the use of prayer. Prayer is not the *duty*, but the highest and the most valuable *privilege* of the Christian. It is the permitted

intercourse of man with the great Author of his being; but it should be *private*, for it calls for the whole and exclusive devotion of the mind to that one object; it should be *individual*—for with what propriety, or what effect, can others join in the out-pourings of the mind when addressed to the invisible but all-seeing Maker of the universe; it should be *personal*—for how can such feelings be conveyed by substitute, or expressed by delegation; and, finally, it should be offered up in the manner which God himself has deigned by his messenger to prescribe,—or how can we venture to hope that it will be effectual? We cannot, therefore, better conclude these essays, intended to disprove the scripture authority of public social prayer, than by *again* repeating the command of our master Jesus to his disciples: "*But thou, when thou prayest, ENTER INTO THY "CLOSET, AND WHEN THOU HAST SHUT THE DOOR, pray "IN SECRET to thy Father; and thy Father which seeth in "secret, shall reward thee openly.*"

DISSENTERS' MARRIAGES.

(*Supplemental Article, see p.*313.)

THE article under the above title, in the present number, was in the press, when W. Smith, the member for Norwich, brought a bill into the House of Commons, for the relief of Unitarian dissenters from the marriage ceremony, similar in principle to the one introduced into the House of Lords, the preceding session, by the Marquis of Lansdown. We have the pleasing task of recording the triumphant progress of the bill through the lower house of parliament. The debate on the second reading of this bill took place March 25, 1825. A Mr. Robertson appears to have laid himself out, upon this occasion, as the determined opponent of concession to the claims of conscience, the undivided honours of which opposition it would be injustice to deny him, seeing that not a single member in the House of Commons was to be found to support his objections, or to second the amendment by which he sought to defeat the bill. Dr. Lushington advocated the measure for relief with his usual ability; and—as

tending to evidence the progress which this question has made, from the practice of the Freethinking Christians in *protesting* at the altar of the established church against the marriage ceremony—we refer the reader to the following extract from his speech as reported in the Morning Chronicle:—

"He would ask—could it be consistent with true piety, that a man should be obliged to utter with his mouth at the altar that which he abhorred in his heart? Nothing could be more disgraceful than the scenes which had taken place at the marriages of dissenters. Nothing could be more injurious to the character of the established church, or to the feelings of its ministers, than to be compelled to receive the *protests* of dissenters to the established form of marriage. If it were not trespassing upon the patience of the house, he could state four or five instances where *protests* had been made in the face of the church, and at the moment when the marriage ceremony had been about to be solemnized. Parties had openly avowed—'*We come here by compulsion, and we repeat a form which in our conscience we repudiate and reject: this form is a violation of our conscience, and we submit to it only, because without it, we cannot enjoy a civil right which ought to be common to all.*' How preposterous was this when from this country we had but to cross the Tweed, and throw ourselves on the mercy of a blacksmith, or a methodist; and when we came back, we had a good and valid marriage, giving our children all the benefits of inheritance, legitimacy, &c., the same as if the marriage had taken place according to the most solemn rites of the church of England."

The whole speech of Dr. Lushington, who had evidently read the article on *Dissenters Marriages*, in the third number of our Register, was well calculated to inform the House of the merits of this question, but as it contained nothing that can prove new to our readers, we content ourselves with the above extract. On the 29th of March, upon W. Smith moving the order of the day for the committal of the Dissenters' Marriage Bill, Mr. Robertson moved that the bill be committed that day six months. This motion was negatived without a division. On the 2nd of May, when it was moved that the House should take into further consideration the report of the committee on the Dissenters' Marriage Bill, the same gentleman moved, as an amendment, that the report should be considered that day six months:—no one seconding the amendment, the original motion was put and agreed to. The speech of the honourable gentleman, in moving this amendment, was clearly worthy of the cause—we subjoin the following brief report from the Chronicle:—

"Mr Robertson said the protestant (Unitarian) dissenters were not so nearly allied to the church of England, nor so much Christians, as the *Mahomedans*. The honourable gentleman supported his opinion by reading various passages from the Koran. He even thought the dissenters were as bad as the *Jews*, for both equally denied the divinity of Christ."

The ignorance—the palpable ignorance—of these observations it were needless to expose; but, assuming the concluding observation to be true, that Unitarian dissenters are as bad—that is, we presume, as *unbelieving*—as the Jews, would that be a reason for denying them their civil rights?—clearly not, for the very right in question, the *legality of marriage*, without submission to the church ceremony, is conceded to the Jews! The honourable gentleman, in his allusion to the *Jews*, meant only to be illiberal, but he was so unlucky in the display of his illiberality, as by his own illustration, to destroy his own argument! The Unitarian dissenters will, however, readily pardon Mr. Robertson's opposition to their claims, either as Christians or as citizens, as it would be difficult for them to decide, whether they would most prefer that the bill for their relief should have passed the House of Commons without opposition, or that it should have been opposed only by the arguments of—Mr. Robertson.

The House of Commons, then, have sanctioned the bill, enabling Unitarian dissenters to contract marriage without submission to the forms and creed of the established church; they have done this, not as they so recently sanctioned the bill for Catholic emancipation, by a trial of strength, and the efforts of a party, securing to the measure at last, only a feeble majority—but as the unanimous and recorded sense of the Commons House of Parliament, was the bill for the relief of Unitarians sent up to the House of Lords. Great is our consolation in placing this circumstance upon record, for great is the tribute which it affords to the enlightenment of the age, to the rights of conscience, and to the justice of that cause, which we have so long and so consistently maintained!

We proceed briefly to notice the fate of the bill in the House of Lords. On the 3d of June, the Marquis of Lansdown moved its second reading, upon which an important and animated discussion ensued. The bill being supported by the Marquis of Lansdown, Lord Liverpool, Lord Calthorpe, the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Bishop of Litchfield and Coventry; and opposed by the Lord Chancellor, Lord Redesdale, the Bishop of Bath and Wells, and the Bishop of Chester, when, upon a division, there appeared for the second reading—

Contents - - - - - - - - -	32
Proxies - - - - - - - - -	12
	44

Non Contents	31
Proxies	18
	49

By which it appears, that of the lords present at the debate, a majority of *one* was in favour of the bill; and the proxies being added, leaves a majority of *five* only against it. By this small majority was this bill, which had been sanctioned by the other branch of the legislature, finally defeated. That the votes of the bishops have given this majority it is important to bear in mind; not forgetting, at the same time, that the more enlightened and liberal members of the spiritual bench, were in its favour; and how any sincere friends to the church or to religion, can reconcile it to themselves to dissent from the sentiment expressed in the debate by the ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY, we are at a loss to discover. His lordship said—

"He agreed to the bill upon these grounds, because it not only went to give relief to the consciences of Unitarians, but also to the ministers of the established church. He believed, in that temper which became the Christian school—that the scruples of the Unitarians were sincere; *and he wished for ever to remove, so far as respected this evil,* THAT UNHALLOWED EQUIVOCATION *which had been* TOO LONG *practised with regard to this ceremonial of the established church.*"

It is not our intention to present to the reader any general report of the debate in the House of Lords on this occasion, as the sentiments expressed were for the most part the same with those delivered in the debate during the former session, and on which we have sufficiently remarked in the article under the same title in the present number. As, however, our own body, the *Freethinking Christians,* was, for the first time, introduced by name into the debate, and as the learned and distinguished prelate, by whom we were thus so especially noticed, appeared so desirous of doing justice to our labours and consistency with regard to the marriage ceremony, we cannot do less than insert some extracts from the report of his lordship's speech on this occasion—which, though it was a speech in favour of relief, ended in a vote against it. Should his lordship's next vote upon this question be, as we are entitled to expect, in favour of our claims, we shall accept it with gratitude, even though his speech should be against us.

"The bishop of Chester said he should make very few observations, and those only that the vote he should that evening give might not be liable to a misconstruction. He thought that the difference of opinion which existed between the established church and the Unitarians, was as to one of the most

fundamental and vital articles of their belief. There could be no question of the vast importance of their scruples if they thought that the doctrines of the Trinity had no foundation in the scriptures, if they thought that divine honours were not justly paid to it, and therefore could not be married according to the ceremonies of the church without worshipping the Trinity, and thus violating their conscience. If they had such scruples, he sincerely thought they ought to be relieved. On so important an article of faith it would be unjust to accuse them of insincerity and hypocricy. It was only at a recent date that the Unitarians had thought of the present matter. They had been goaded and lashed into the present application by certain persons calling themselves *Freethinking Christians*. This fact he hoped he should be able to prove to the satisfaction of the house. He knew not whether it was customary to read extracts from books, but if he was permitted he should do so. (Cries of 'Read.') The paragraph he should read was from a periodical work, published by those *Freethinkers*, and called the 'QUARTERLY REGISTER.' He gave them the title of *Freethinkers*, or *Freetalkers*, but as for being *Christians*, there might be some inclined to doubt their right to the title, as the very first article in their publication was directed against the *public worship of the country*. The extract he should read was from a very clever article on the *Marriage ceremony*, which made him the more regret that the author had disgraced it with some most illiberal abuse of the clergy. (The right reverend prelate here read a *long extract* from the above work, urging the Unitarians to make the present application.) This passage he quoted to show that the present claims were of very recent date, and that if it should be deemed expedient to defer the question, no great greviance would be imposed, as it had been borne with so much patience for so long a period. He thought that some persons might not acknowledge the doctrine of the Trinity, who yet would have no objection to the marriage ceremony as performed by the established church. He himself knew several Unitarians, who, had they thought it a defection from their principles, would not he was sure, have submitted to it. He also thought that there might be some men who disbelieved the Trinity, and had objections on that account to the marriage ceremony of the church of England. This bill would relieve the latter, and he thought they were entitled to relief. But this measure would not only relieve Unitarians, but also the church establishment itself; for few things, he knew by experience, could be more painful than to be required to administer ordinances to persons who not only scoffed and derided at them, but totally disbelieved them. He should therefore willingly place the Unitarians on the same footing with the Quakers before the passing of the Marriage Act, which compulsory regulation he would take that opportunity to state the church had nothing to do with. It was not their desire to impose their doctrines on those who rejected them; but he thought that the present bill was not sufficiently calculated to provide against clandestine marriages which the peculiar conformation of the Quaker's society did. This was one of his objections to the present measure, but he still thought that means might be devised to relieve those contemplated in the bill. It was to the form of the present bill that he objected; in short to the whole machinery of the bill, and as that could not be remedied in the committee, he should therefore vote against it. He had already stated that Unitarians denied that there was any thing sacred in the marriage ceremony, and considered it merely as a civil contract. He now held in his hand *a protest*, signed by two persons named *Fearon* and *Thompson*, in which they declared marriage to be merely *a civil contract*. They disclaimed the interference of the church in this most important point, and contended that it ought to have no concern with it whatever, and that they ought to be married like the Quakers,

but under the cognizance of the state, through the medium of its civil functionaries. The difficulty was to provide for the relief of the Unitarians and the church, and at the same time guard against clandestine marriages. It was upon these considerations that he should be obliged to oppose the bill in its present form."

We are gratified to learn that the bishop of Chester is a reader of our Register, and as he is pleased to ascribe merit to our pages, we trust his lordship may not only be enlightened but improved by their perusal. Addressing his lordship, then, as one of our readers, may we be permitted to suggest, how little befitting it is, either in the scholar or the Christian, to call names, or to enlist in his support a popular prejudice, by means of an obvious play upon words. A "Freethinking "*Christian*" must be a *Christian;* a "*Freethinker*" may be an *unbeliever*, and, by common acceptance, the term is so understood. In the denomination of our body, "*Christian*" is the substantial character—*Freethinking* the circumstance, only, by which it is distinguished. In a word, we are *believers in Christianity*, and we are *peculiarly* so from *freethinking*, with regard to its evidences, its principles, and its doctrines. It is not so with the bishop of Chester; a bishopric and a rich city living are sore obstacles to *freethinking* in matters of religion. But if his lordship does not approve our principles, or our name, he need not misrepresent the one or pervert the other. Neither is it liberal to refuse to our body the character of Christian, because, after serious examination, we are compelled to deny that *public social prayer* is authorized by scripture, or sanctioned by the authority or example of Jesus. Far more characteristic would it be of a liberal mind and an honest cause, to examine and to answer the arguments exhibited in our Register, against the scripture authority of public social prayer, than to insinuate disbelief in revelation, on account of our rejection of a practice, unsupported, as we maintain, by revelation. It has been stated, upon the authority of a gentlemen, present at the debate in the House of Lords, that the learned prelate in his speech on the above occasion, thought fit to allude to *the trade* of an esteemed member of our body, whom his lordship was pleased to describe as our *founder* or *head:* we will hope, rather, that our informant was under some mis-apprehension, as we find no such allusion in the newspaper reports of his lordship's speech. Should, however, which we would feign disbelieve, should such an allusion have been made, we beg to state that our *founder*, the *head* of our body, was *not* of

the trade reported to have been named on this occasion;—he was, it is true, of humble origin, but by trade *a carpenter*!—Does this offend your lordship? What then if we should confess, that among the pillars of our church, we rank a *tent-maker* of Tarsus, and a *fisherman* of Galilee? Oh! if in that most august assembly of the realm, clothed in the vesture of earthly grandeur, and pressing forward towards the *mark of the prize of his high calling*, a bishop should be found to allude in terms of disparagement to the worldly calling of the founder of our church, we should more than suspect, that his lordship had "stedfastly set his face "to go" *not* "to Jerusalem," but to—DURHAM! But the bishop of Chester is, we should have expected, too enlightened, too liberal, too well read in the history of Him, who was "*despised and rejected of men*," to have hazarded the reflection which, in the way of report only, we have alluded to; nor can we doubt but that upon reconsideration, his lordship will feel how little appropriate to the occasion it was to insinuate a charge of infidelity against our body, when the very grounds of our objections to the marriage ceremony, depend upon and arise out of our conscientious belief in the divine authority of the Christian religion.

In noticing the speech of the bishop of Chester it is gratifying to find his lordship is favourable to the principle upon which relief is sought from the present operation of the law with regard to marriage, and if the Unitarian body should persevere in their just claim, that relief *cannot* be long delayed. We close this supplemental article by subjoining the spirited address published by the Unitarian body, on the occasion of the rejection of the bill for their relief by the House of Lords.

"UNITARIAN MARRIAGE BILL.

"At a special meeting of the committee of the British and Foreign Unitarian Association, held the 9th June, 1825,

"*Resolved*, That this society feels sincere gratitude towards that branch of the legislature which has unanimously admitted and (as far as lay in its power) redressed the complaint of the Unitarian dissenters, with regard to the arbitrary requirements of the present marriage law; as well as towards those members of the other house who have once more lent their assistance in the promotion of the principles of liberality and justice.

"That this society again publicly pledges the body which it represents, to seek from session to session that redress, which it asks not as a boon, but as what ought to be the right of every citizen of a free state; and to appeal, at every opportunity, to the good sense and justice of the British Public, for the decision of the question, whether it be either wise or consistent with

the honour and character of a church, claiming to be founded on the principles of religious liberty, to impose upon a class of dissenters, whom it professes to tolerate, a vexatious system of compulsive conformity, destructive of the only rational object of a religious ceremonial, and unwarranted even by the plea of civil expediency.

"That in the mean time the scandal will not lie at the door of the Unitarian dissenters, if *the altars* which they are compelled to attend, become the scene of PUBLIC PROTESTS from which they have, as a body, hitherto refrained from feelings of delicacy towards those ministers of the church whom the law compels to be the instruments of this species of religious coercion, and from a reliance on the candid and liberal dispositions of those whose opinions they could not but conceive would have great weight with the legislature."

NOTICES.

THE two volumes of the Freethinking Christians' Quarterly Register are now complete, and may be had in boards, at the office of our Printer, Price 8s. 6d. each. Unlike most periodical publications, these volumes consist generally of subjects of permanent interest and importance to the inquirer after religious truth.

To our Subscribers generally, and to various Correspondents, we have to apologize for the delay in the publication of the present Number.

In our strictures on the Female Committee of Newgate, contained in our last, we professed an expectation that, if the parties felt themselves aggrieved, they would come forward by some "*authorized agent*," to state in what we have wronged them. None such have appeared. Two *unauthorized* communications have, however, been received; the one signed H. S. the other from the pen of our friend J. F. Both the writers are evidently very angry, and consequently very unfit, in that state, to be entrusted with the defence of the lady whose cause they espouse. By this time, indeed, we feel little doubt they must be so far restored to good humour as to feel their obligation to us for not setting their intemperance in type, or stitching their recrimination within our wrappers, to evidence their lack of argument. Besides, we are much mistaken if even the lady herself, whose conduct they undertake to defend, has not the good sense to confess the justice of our criticisms; for who now hears any thing of the Public follies of—MRS. FRY?

INDEX.

H. Hetherington, Printer, 13, Kingsgate Street, Holborn.

a f
HM